

R. F. Lang, New York, favoring passage of the Weeks bill (H. R. 27567) for a 1-cent letter postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of C. H. Blackall, Boston, Mass., favoring adoption of the Mall site and design as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the New York Fruit Growers' Association, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7208, for making the trans-Atlantic steamships liable for the damages of packages, etc., caused through negligence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of the Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.; C. P. Nelson, Chicago, Ill.; John Burroughs, New York; and Herbert S. Gardner, favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Long Island Automobile Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., asking that the Lincoln memorial highway bill be in the keeping of the Appropriation Committee instead of the Library Committee; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, Trenton, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of national forests to the States wherein they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Legislative Board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring the passage of the Federal workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Conservation Commission, favoring the passage of the Weeks bill making appropriation for the Federal protection of forests from fires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Fruit Growers' Association, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7208, for making the trans-Atlantic steamships liable for the damages of packages, etc., caused through negligence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., favoring passage of legislation for national ownership and control of all public telephone and telegraph lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Cook County Farmers' Association, protesting against the passage of legislation for the reduction of tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Petition of citizens of Chattanooga, Tenn., protesting against the passage of House bill 5382—the Brantley workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the New York Fruit Growers' Association, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7208, for making the trans-Atlantic steamships liable for the damages of packages, etc., caused through negligence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of the national forests to the States within which they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Conservation Commission, favoring passage of legislation for an increase in the appropriation to aid Federal protection of forests from fire; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, of Eureka, Cal., favoring the passage of Haugen bill, preventing the selling of any colored imitation of butter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of citizens of Lincoln and Flathead, Mont., favoring the passage of legislation preventing any trust, corporation, or individual from obtaining more than 160 acres of land or timber from the Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 27545) for the relief of James Diamond for horse lost while hired by the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of the T Square Club, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the adoption of the Mall site and design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Bourse, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7503, for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of Daniel O'Connell Division, No. 9, Ancient Order of Hibernians, protesting against

having post offices open for delivery of mail on Sunday; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of Hoggison Bros., New York; C. H. Blackall, Boston; the American Group of the Société des Architectes Diplômés par le Gouvernement Français, New York; the Mural Painters, New York; the Architectural League of New York; and the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, New York, favoring the adoption of the Mall site and the design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the American Automobile Association, favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of the national highway from Washington to Gettysburg as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Illinois Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, Chicago, Ill., favoring the adoption of the Mall site, but protesting against the design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for the memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich., favoring the passage of the McLean bill, granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Farmers' National Congress, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3, for Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Federation of Jewish Farmers of America, New York, favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of a system of farmers' credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the National Association of Railway Commissioners, favoring the passage of Senate bill 6099, for the establishment of a uniform classification of freight in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Duchess Manufacturing Co., Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 27567, for a 1-cent letter postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Sol Bloom (Inc.), New York, protesting against the passage of section 2 of the Oldfield patent bill, preventing the fixing of prices by the manufacturers of patent goods; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the United States Live Stock Sanitary Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation to increase the appropriation for the eradication of ticks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Conservation Commission, favoring passage of legislation for an increase in appropriation to aid Federal protection of forests from fire; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Legislative Board, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring the passage of the workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the national forests to the control and ownership of the States within which they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Long Island Auto Club, favoring the keeping of the Lincoln memorial highway bill in the hands of the Appropriations Committee instead of the Library Committee; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 29, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. GALLINGER) laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Florence L. Braun, daughter and sole heir of Thomas J. Lucas, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1045);

Weltha Post Leggett, widow of Mortimer D. Leggett, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1044);

Daniel Pelton Duffie, son and sole heir of Alfred N. Duffie, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1043);

Mary G. Carr, widow of Joseph B. Carr, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1042);

Morgan K. Barnum, Malvern Hill Barnum, and Reynolds Barnum, children and sole heirs of Henry A. Barnum, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1041); and

L. A. Williams, administrator of Edward S. Bragg, deceased, v. United States (S. Doc. No. 1040).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 28180) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2600. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prevent the exhibition of obscene, lewd, indecent, or vulgar pictures in public places of amusement in the District of Columbia;

S. 6919. An act to amend subchapter 2 of chapter 19 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

S. 7162. An act to amend section 801 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

S. 7508. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to reincorporate and preserve all the corporate franchises and property rights of the de facto corporation known as the German Orphan Asylum Association of the District of Columbia";

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution granting to the Fifth Regiment Maryland National Guard the use of the corridors of the courthouse of the District of Columbia upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the marshal of the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect on March 4, 1913, etc.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the Church Federation Council of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ASHURST presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Phoenix, Ariz., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry landowners and homesteaders of Palo Verde Valley, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the Homesteaders Irrigation Co., of Palo Verde Valley, a perpetual right to sufficient water to irrigate that valley, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Claremont, N. H., and a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Amesbury, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of members of the camps of Spanish War Veterans of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and minor children of Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Dogden, N. Dak., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation fixing the requirements governing the receipt, transmission, delivery, and preservation of messages of interstate telegraph and telephone companies, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of the board of directors of the Philadelphia Bourse, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for a reduction of the rate of postage on first-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wilkesburg, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to create

a board of river regulation, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventist Churches of Leslie, Watrousville, Bay City, Spring Arbor, Marine City, Scottville, Otter Lake, and Clifford Lake, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I present a telegram from Charles H. Beckwith, counsel of the Board of Trade of Springfield, Mass., which I ask may be read and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., January 27, 1913.

Hon. FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

It is absolutely necessary to obtain adequate navigation on Connecticut River for western Massachusetts that Connecticut River bill be passed without amendment at this session of Congress.

SPRINGFIELD BOARD OF TRADE,
CHARLES H. BECKWITH, Counsel.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia presented an affidavit in support of the bill (S. 2043) granting a pension to R. L. Miller, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Anacostia Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying that an increase be made in the police force of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

KIOWA AND COMANCHE INDIAN RESERVATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 1046).

Mr. OWEN. I present a memorial from the governor of Oklahoma, relative to certain lands granted to the State of Oklahoma within the Kiowa and Comanche Reservations. I ask that the memorial, with the accompanying illustration, be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENTIAL TERM.

Mr. WORKS. I submit some additional press clippings from the various newspapers in the country bearing upon Senate joint resolution No. 78. I do this because of the claim made on the floor of the Senate that no public interest is being taken in this proposed constitutional amendment. I ask that the clippings may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: Opinions of the press in 1912, compiled by the National Business League of America, preliminary to its nation-wide campaign for a single six-year term for the President of the United States, with ineligibility forever thereafter.

[From the Age, Birmingham, Ala.]

Congressman CLAYTON, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, presents a brief but strong report in support of the proposed constitutional proposition to extend the presidential term to six years and to render a President ineligible to a second term, even though a Vice President succeed to the office and had served but a small fraction of a full term.

Mr. CLAYTON urges the adoption of the proposition because it would lead to higher efficiency in administration, and it would put an end to machine building in the highest office in the gift of the people.

The common sense of the voters will put the proposition into the Constitution if Congress can be induced to submit it. Once ratified it would put an end not only to third-term movements but also to second terms, which are nearly as vicious.

[From the Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala.]

Inasmuch as the proposition of Representative CLAYTON, of Alabama, to make a presidential term six years has been in the minds of the people for some months, and has met with more or less favor, it is entirely probable that six years and not four will be the final choice of the party when the amendment is submitted to the people.

[From the Republican, Phoenix, Ariz.]

The sentiment in favor of a single presidential term is spreading. Senator WORKS has introduced a bill providing for a single term, and the Indiana Republican convention last week adopted a resolution in favor of a single term of six years.

The only objection that might be offered would be that six years might be too long a period; that within that time the people might desire a change of policies. In that respect a four-year term would be better. There is nothing, however, to be said in favor of two terms. If at the end of the President's term the people are satisfied with his policies and the manner of their execution, they may elect another man committed to them.

Under our present system a President, though he might prefer to retire to private life, is practically compelled to seek a renomination and a reelection as an indorsement of his administration.

[From the Herald, Fresno, Cal.]

There is much to be said in favor of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to increase the presidential term

to six years and to make an incumbent forever ineligible for reelection. The longer term would reduce the frequency of elections, lengthen the period between the seasons of business disturbance caused by presidential contests, and give the incumbent all the time necessary to carry out his policies.

[From the Call, San Francisco, Cal.]

General discussion in the press of the country brings out a strong sentiment in favor of the proposition to amend the National Constitution by making the term of President six years and prohibiting reelection. The idea is as old as the Republic. Seven States in the convention of 1787 favored a seven-year term, without right of reelection, and only two States were opposed. Later nine States voted for a six-year term, and only one was opposed. Just why the present plan was finally adopted has never been clearly explained.

The weight of authority favors the change proposed. President Jackson, in 1829, recommended a six-year term without reelection. President Hayes and President Grant followed this example, with this difference, that Grant favored a seven-year term. President Taft has endorsed the proposition, and there is reason to believe that a majority of the present Congress favors it.

[From the Telegram, Bridgeport, Conn.]

With nothing to fear or to hope for at the end of a six-year term, knowing that it would bring with it noneligibility either to a succeeding or a nonconsecutive lease of power, the President would be a disinterested servant of the people for every moment of his service, and those who hold minor offices would cease from troubling. All concerned might be persuaded to remember that they are making history and therefore induced to do their best.

[From the Herald, New Britain, Conn.]

A six-year term would be a distinct advantage to the country, for the reason that it would insure the occupant of the Presidency giving his complete attention to the affairs of state and not to strengthening himself for another term. In other words, he would not play politics. No sooner is a man inaugurated President than he begins to build fences for a second term, and it is a sort of unwritten law that he should be retained in office. This may be desirable with the tenure of office four years, but it would not be desirable if the term was six years. A President would then have an opportunity to work out his governmental policies through three Congresses and in this way would be able to benefit the country more than under the present system. It has been said that if the President was a good man and rendered valuable service, that he should be retained in office, but that argument is neither wise nor logical. To do that would probably mean the establishment of a machine that would soon become corrupt and difficult to remove from power.

[From the Journal-Courier, New Haven, Conn.]

President Taft would limit the presidential office to a single term of six years, and he gives a new reason why he thinks so. He says, "I am a little specific in this matter, because it seems necessary to be, so in order to be understood, I don't care how unambitious or modest a President is, I don't care how determined he is that he himself will not secure his re-nomination (and there are very few indeed who go to that extent), still his subordinates equally interested with him in his reelection will, whenever they have the opportunity, exert their influence and divide their time between the public service and the effort to secure their chief's re-nomination and reelection. It is different to prevent the whole administration from losing a part of its effectiveness for the public good by this diversion to political effort for at least a year of the four of each administration." The single term, then, of six years will achieve two results—it will leave the Chief Executive free to give his best service to the people without temptation of any kind and it will greatly increase the efficiency of the whole administration of government.

[From the Register, New Haven, Conn.]

There are positive arguments for the change. Four years is too short a time for a President to accomplish anything, chiefly because more or less of his time is wasted by the ambition to succeed himself. Increase his term by 50 per cent and relieve him of all worry to the future and you have by at least 100 per cent increased his net effectiveness for the term. Six years is nearly the cycle of man's physical renewal. It is a time in which the able man might accomplish something. Set that as at once his incentive and his limit—his incentive to make his impress on the history of his country then or not at all, his protection as well as his limit—and men worthy to be our Presidents will show a difference in their accomplishments in the office.

[From The Times, Leavenworth, Kans.]

There are many reasons in favor of making this change. Chief of these is, of course, the oft-repeated argument that it would take from the President the motive of ambition to be reelected, and from the beginning of the administration he would be thinking only of giving the country a creditable administration. In such case the politician would have less influence with him and the statesman more. With no second term in which to amend his record a President would use his utmost endeavors to make the best possible record during his one term.

That the proposed amendment would add greatly to the dignity of the office of President can readily be seen. It would make the President more independent, less sensitive to criticism, and after a time less criticized. It would place him where there would be no temptation to take part in unseemly struggles for office, and soon the office of President would come to be looked upon as is that of justice of the Supreme Court—as an office to be filled only by men of high character and learning and men of unquestioned honor and patriotism.

[From the Chicago Journal, Chicago, Ill.]

It is the duty of Congress to pass the single-term, six-year amendment at once. That amendment must provide that no person who has served six years in the White House shall be eligible to election under the new rule. If this amendment is put through Congress without delay the people will have time to ratify it before 1916; and the country will be spared a great deal of trouble and expense.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Chicago, Ill.]

Congress evidently is not willing at this time to consider on its merits the Works resolution for a constitutional amendment providing a single term of six years for each President and Vice President of the United States. In the Senate the other day debate on the resolution was turned into a political dispute as to the relative magnitude of the indiscretions committed by the men now seeking the Presidency. In the House a similar resolution has been shelved until the next session of Congress. Friends of this desirable reform, however, should not permit it to be thrust aside for any great length of time. It must come, and the sooner it comes the better.

So many abuses in government are bred by the second-term frenzy that attacks nearly every President as soon as he sets foot within the White House, that the people of the Nation would gladly lengthen the term of each Executive by two years in exchange for the privilege of making a really good official out of him, through the simple expedient of denying him a reelection.

The contention advanced by supporters of the present system that a President would have no adequate incentive to give good service to the people if the inducement of a second term were not held out to him is insincere. It is perfectly well known that the prospect of a second term is a demoralizing prospect. It unnerves the Executive arm far more frequently than does anything else. Its influence is good in no respect.

In urging Congress to pass the Works resolution its supporters insist that the President of the United States should be freed from the temptation to "play politics." Right, not political expediency, must direct Executive action in the White House.

[From the Record-Herald, Chicago, Ill.]

The proposed amendment to the Constitution restricting the President to one term of six years probably will bring forward few fresh arguments. It is an old question, as old, indeed, as the Government itself, and the wisdom of so restricting the Chief Executive's term has been debated at intervals since the time of Jackson. Yet the later arguments in favor of the reform are strikingly similar to those advanced when the fathers were framing the Government.

The perils of leaving a President free to succeed himself if he can have been considered by students of our form of Government from the first. De Tocqueville considered them, Bryce refers to them, and M. Otrogorski, in his Democracy and the Party System in the United States, published in 1910, gives it as his opinion that the reelection of the President must be prohibited. The Russian critic states his case after this fashion:

"The rescue of the Federal service from politics must be completed by submitting it to no influence but that of the Chief Executive and his principal officers throughout the country, and to no end but that of the public weal. Not only from the bosses at Washington must the President be emancipated, but from the party machine altogether. And that can not be achieved so long as the President looks for reelection. The presidential term should be lengthened to seven years and the reelection of the President prohibited."

There, in brief, is the argument of those who have opposed the reelection of the President, though it has been given in much more detail by other writers and speakers. But the gist of the matter is that the President must not be a politician. He must not use the great powers of his office to insure reelection. His appointments must not be made with an eye on the support of State bosses; he must not be tempted to lay aside his convictions and play the demagogue in order to win votes; his dignity must not suffer from a scramble to keep in his seat. Said Mr. Randolph, speaking in the constitutional convention, "If he (the President) ought to be independent, he should not be left under a temptation to court a reappointment."

This thought seemed to have pursued the members of the convention from the very moment they began to consider the powers which were to be vested in the Chief Executive. On August 6 the committee of detail, to whom had been referred the various proposals, reported in favor of electing a President for a seven-year term and making him ineligible for a second term. This proposal in different forms was considered again and again.

There were some present who felt that a Chief Executive's dignity must suffer through being forced to join the mass again as a common citizen. To these spoke "Dr." Franklin, with his dry humor:

"In free governments the rulers are the servants and the people their superiors and sovereigns. For the former, therefore, to return among the latter was not to degrade but to promote them. And it would be imposing an unreasonable burden on them to keep them always in a state of servitude and not allow them to become again one of the masters."

In the end the convention took no action restricting the President's eligibility for reelection. It was not till the time of Jackson that the question again became a real issue. Jackson's friends said during the campaign that he would not consent to run a second time, and this declaration is thought to have added to the popularity of the candidate. He was a staunch supporter of the principle of one term when he took over the office of President. In his first message to Congress, in December, 1829, he suggested the wisdom of restricting the President to one term. In his annual message of the following year he said:

"In order, particularly, that this appointee may be placed beyond the reach of any improper influence, in order that he may approach the solemn responsibilities of the highest office in the gift of a free people, uncommitted to any other course than the strict line of constitutional duty, and that the securities for this independence may be rendered as strong as the nature of power and the weakness of its possessor will admit, I can not too earnestly invite your attention to the propriety of promoting such amendment of the Constitution as will render him ineligible after one term of service."

There can be little doubt that Jackson was sincere in his efforts to have the President's term restricted, notwithstanding the fact that he stood for reelection himself. It is pretty generally admitted that up to the time of his death he continued to believe what he had charged in his first campaign, that there was a cabal to continue President Adams in office, and that he had performed an important public service in defeating its plans.

Certain it is that from the time of Jackson down to Lincoln a clearly defined popular prejudice existed against the idea of a second term for the Chief Magistrate. This prejudice was overcome in the case of Lincoln by the demands of an extraordinary situation.

Later on the question of restricting the Executive's term was brought before the public when President Grant showed a desire for a third term. But even when he became the candidate of his party for a

second term there were those who objected strenuously. Chief of these was Horace Greeley, who, having alienated a considerable portion of his own party, became the candidate of the Democratic and Liberal Republican Parties against Grant. During the campaign which ensued the issue of the second term was raised, and Mr. Greeley opposed it with all the eloquence and force for which he was noted.

In an article contributed to a now defunct periodical called the *Galaxy*, in 1872, Mr. Greeley said:

"All that is needed is an intelligent, earnest, widespread conviction that the practice of reelecting a Chief Magistrate while in office is fraught with evil and peril; that it distracts his attention from the proper cares and duties of his station and impels him to consider not who are the fittest and most worthy to fill the offices in his gift, but what choice will be most likely to improve his chances of re-election."

"Here is the right man for the Supreme Court, who has no influential clique at his back; here is a rival who is neither so capable nor so worthy, but whose friends control the party machine in a populous State and can send delegates to the approaching national convention either for or against the incumbent of the White House; who that knows human nature can doubt that the less fit aspirant has the better prospect of obtaining that judgeship? And this instance may stand for a thousand."

Speakers and writers of that day who joined in the discussion were accustomed to point to at least one excellence in the constitution of the Confederate States so recently overthrown. That constitution, they said, reflected at least one bit of experience which the Federal Government had had and had failed to benefit by. It made the President ineligible to succeed himself.

[From the *Mall*, Moline, Ill.]

Every argument for a one-term limitation is sound. Not one argument so far advanced against it bears dissection. By making the term of the President six years and barring him from again seeking the office, he will be left to work solely for the good of the country from the first day.

[From the *Chronicle*, Marion, Ind.]

There is soundness and wisdom in Mr. Taft's suggestion of a single term of six years for our Presidents. The gain to the people would be obvious and very great. In many ways a presidential campaign is a public nuisance. The minds of the people are distracted, business, whether foolishly or not, has acquired the habit of coming to a halt, as though some great calamity impended—probably Mr. Taft will recall, not without a reminiscent smile, that during the late campaign something was said about the closing of factory doors in case the voting went wrong—and men, women, too, are drenched with a flood of utterance and wearied with passionate mouthings. It is unnecessary; it is stupid. If we should reduce the frequency of the national upheaval from three times in 12 years to twice in 12 years the gain would be immense. There would be the added and important advantage of shielding the incumbent of the office from the temptation to use power and patronage in the effort to secure a second term.

[From the *Gazette*, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.]

A six-year term would make the country more democratic. It would prevent the building up of political machines whose main purpose is to perpetuate some man or set of men in office.

The six-year term would give a President a better opportunity to make good. It would be unproductive of harm, because the Nation always elects a fairly representative man to the Chief Magistracy.

A six-year term would lessen the political turmoil, and that alone would be worth a great deal more than "the price of admission."

By all means let us have the single six-year term.

[From the *Times-Democrat*, New Orleans, La.]

More than one presidential record has been marred by this seeking after a second term. During two years out of the four the desire for renomination influences, to a greater or less extent, the average Executive's official acts and colors his view of pending issues and questions. There is no reason to believe that we can, under the present system, get entirely away from that practice and custom. But by rigid limitation of the President's term of service, definitely fixed by the law of the land, we can relieve the Executive of the temptation now placed in his way. Measurably we can insure that he will serve the Nation during his full term of office instead of using his office for a part of the term to serve his own ambitions and candidacy for renomination. An aggressive campaign for the adoption of the one-term plan ought to be organized, we think, at once, while its wisdom and necessity are so widely admitted by the voters.

[From the *Times*, Cumberland, Md.]

Some unconscious humorist assures the *Chicago Record-Herald* that "there is no public sentiment" in favor of the single six-year presidential term proposed.

We are bound to admit that we have heard no riotous demonstrations by advocates of such an amendment to the Constitution. But the majority of the Members of Congress favor it; the respective Judiciary Committees of the two Houses have indorsed it; progressive and independent newspapers are urging it; and men of light and leading in every part of the country are "coming out" for it. The National Business League of America is working for it.

In the Senate two insurgents, CUMMINS and WORKS, are fathering the amendment, and some of its opponents are threatening a filibuster to prevent action on the resolution submitting it. They know that it will pass if it reaches a vote.

The unconscious humorist or noise-loving editors who fail to discover public sentiment for the amendment should try to understand that public sentiment is not always expressed by stormy mass meetings addressed by excited orators.

[From the *Gazette*, Haverhill, Mass.]

There is nothing in the Constitution as it now is to prevent a life tenure of the presidential office. When the Constitution was created no one had any reason to suppose that the Executive department would become so powerful as it has become. Nothing has stood in the way of long-continued tenure of the presidential office but wholesome public sentiment and the antithird-term tradition, which arose from Wash-

ington's refusal of a third election. If that tradition is once violated and the barriers against a third term are broken down, they may be down for a long time.

A President in office who is a candidate for reelection has an undue advantage over other candidates in his own party for the nomination, and an undue advantage over his opponent of the other party in the election.

We are coming to the one-term Presidency as rapidly as the circumstances will permit. The present campaign has made sentiment in that direction, and the Clayton resolution may be the means of achieving the result earlier than expected.

[From the *Evening Union*, Springfield, Mass.]

Six years has been suggested as a reasonable limit, and there are many pronounced advocates of the six-year single-term idea, but there are some that favor a single four-year term and others that believe in making it eight years. The arguments in favor of one are as good as those in support of another, except, perhaps, that the four-year term may be a little too short to enable a President to carry out the policies and pledges to which he and his party are committed. But the main idea, the single-term limit, has everything to commend it.

[From the *Call*, Paterson, N. J.]

Many influential men of New York, when asked to comment on the question of a constitutional amendment limiting the President to a single six-year term, expressed themselves favorably to the change. Some thought it would make for greater stability in the business of the country, but it was generally believed by both Republicans and Democrats that the most important effect would be that on the conduct of the incumbent of the office himself. Most of them agreed that under the present four-year term, with eligibility for reelection, the President, no matter how well intentioned he may be, is unavoidably drawn into a certain amount of political intrigue that inevitably interferes with the discharge of his duties in a broad and statesmanlike manner.

[From the *Chautauquan*, Chautauqua, N. Y.]

Andrew Jackson thought that a single term without reelection for a President under any circumstances would add another safeguard to our liberties. Second terms are not now feared as threats to our liberties; whether third or fourth terms are a menace and danger is a matter upon which opinion differs. But what is undeniable and clear is that second and third terms are incompatible with efficient and single-minded public service. The best of men can not be exposed to constant temptation. The temptation of incumbents to use patronage, to build or strengthen machines, to "mend fences," to make sure of delegates, to control conventions, is too strong to be resisted in most cases.

Nor is this all. Men in office who are candidates for second or third terms may, and generally do, consider bills and policies from the political or personal point of view. Some do it unconsciously, but all do it more or less. The incumbent who is not and can not be a candidate again for the same office is free to deal with public matters on their merits, to use his independent and sincere judgment, to make the public good his sole test or concern. This would be an enormous gain to good government and to "the rule of the people."

The more the question is studied the more vital and progressive the single-term idea is seen to be. There is not the least danger that the supply of presidential "timber" will ever be so restricted that second or third terms will be necessary. No man or set of men is really indispensable to an age or generation or nation. Any vigorous, sound body politic contains many men and women who are fit to do the work of the day. To dip into the great mass of citizens and select administrators and servants with an eye to results, without overestimating any individual or underestimating the virtue and intelligence of his equals, is not always an easy task. But stable and prosperous democracies must endeavor to do this very thing. The single six-year presidential term idea is consonant with the warnings of history and with common sense.

[From the *Leader-Republican*, Gloversville, N. Y.]

Much, indeed, might be advanced in favor of the single six-year term as Chief Executive of the Nation, and in the opinion of the *Leader-Republican* a long step in the right direction will have been taken when discussion of the change proposed shall have been crystallized into favorable action. As yet the proposal is a comparatively new one, but it is one which from its practical nature seems destined to grow and expand in favor with the people.

[From the *Financial World*, New York City.]

All classes, even the chronic office-holding politicians, whatever may be their party affiliations or opinions, will hail with satisfaction the preliminary efforts now being made in Congress to submit to the several States an amendment to the National Constitution, so as to extend the presidential term to six years and make the incumbent ineligible to succeed himself.

It would prove a most excellent move if this same rule of nonsuccession were carried further to include every elective office. Politicians are more or less selfish in the consideration of the general welfare, although statesmen in office affect to believe that the interests they have in public affairs—national, State, and local—are above all personal consideration. However, if that interest is not personally touching the pocketbook of officeholders, it is at least fed on the ambition to hold on as long as possible to the honors heaped upon them by their fellowmen. Man would not be man without ambitions.

But limit the Presidency and other elective offices to one term and the probabilities are that the men so honored will apply to their stewardship the very best ability, sincerity, and honesty that is in them. They will realize that there is no further reward to seek when their term of office ends.

The little Republic of Switzerland has demonstrated conclusively the great advantages that lie in limiting offices of state to only one term. One term is enough.

[From the *Eagle*, Brooklyn, N. Y.]

We have confidence that the people and the States will soon set a prohibition of more than a single term in the Constitution itself, incidentally lengthening the one term from four to six years, with no reelection, as could wisely have been done at the start. The term could well be lengthened to reduce strain on a term of the present duration.

It could well be made incapable of repetition, to remove from any President the temptation to pervert his service and patronage to the continuance of himself in place and to stir in each party the growth of statesmen fit to make into Presidents.

[From the Financial World, New York City.]

This much-to-be-desired reform can only be satisfactorily brought about by limiting the Presidency to one term and making that term half as long again as the present four-year tenure. Six years seems generally agreed upon as long enough to allow a new Executive to put through such political measures to which he is committed and on which he has made his campaign for the high office.

It is undeniably true that business halts more or less during a national campaign, if for no other reason than is to be found in the natural hesitating against going ahead when there is the possibility of a change of administration and with it a flood of new laws to which business will have to adjust itself. Six years, therefore, would give to business a period of rest from radical adjustments longer than is possible under our four-year system.

But the greatest handicap the country suffers under our present scheme of electing our Chief Executive is to be found in the right of succession, on which at present there is no limitation. Not a single bar is up to prevent a President succeeding himself as often as he may be able to prevail upon the electors to keep him in office. Only custom is in the way. This was set by George Washington in refusing a third nomination, contending that by serving twice as President he had done his duty toward his country and the people.

The one and the greatest advantage in the one-term movement for President, and which offsets any of the minor defects that may be cited, is that it would effectively do away with the political maneuvering now indulged in by a President in his natural ambition to become his own successor. With one term only possible to him, every President would give the country the best administration within his ability irrespective of political considerations, and more than that could not be expected. Naturally, he would desire that his administration should pass into history as one reflecting fame upon him, and he would act accordingly.

The one-term plan would forever blast the political ambitions which every President now keeps in mind to maintain himself in office through two terms at least, and which so often proves an obstacle to an impartial administration.

[From the Herald, New York City.]

President Taft's plea for one term of six years for the President of the United States will undoubtedly give new impetus to this measure now before Congress.

The reform must come in the shape of a constitutional amendment, and after the bill has passed both Houses and become a law the amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. But cumbersome as the process of amending the Constitution is, this great reform may be much nearer than persons generally suppose.

There has long been a very strong feeling in this country that two terms of four years each are enough for a President. Many persons believe that to limit the only term to six years is too short a period and would extend it to eight years.

With this view the Herald heartily agrees. The term should be eight years instead of six, and then there should be a proviso against any man ever seeking the Presidency again. Indeed, it might be wise to make some financial provisions for retiring Presidents.

But eight years are not too much. Washington served almost eight years; Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and Grant served eight years; Lincoln and McKinley were reelected, but were assassinated before the end of their second terms; Cleveland was elected to a second term after a four years' interim, and Roosevelt was elected to a second term, having filled the uncompleted term of McKinley as his first term.

But to have a President elected for an eight-year term would free the country from much strife, and to provide that there should be but one term would be bound to work for national security.

[From the Evening Journal, New York City.]

Mrs. George J. Gould said to-day that she was an advocate of extending the term of the President of the United States to six years. She thinks that the longer period would give an opportunity for working out presidential reforms, and that a President who could not get a renomination would be less apt to play into the hands of the politicians. She would limit the six-year President to a single term.

"The Presidency of the United States has become the most powerful in the world," she said at her home, No. 657 Fifth Avenue. "So much responsibility and work devolve upon the incumbent of that high office that I sometimes marvel at the ability with which Presidents meet the obligations that are imposed upon them."

"The presidential term should be extended to six years and Presidents should be ineligible for reelection. The results, I am confident, would be a higher standard of public service and a greater devotion to the interests of the people."

"The experience of France, which makes the presidential term seven years, has, in the main, proved highly successful."

[From Leslie's Weekly, New York City.]

The actual advantages of a single six-year presidential term overshadow the possible dangers of the change. The suggestion is made that if the electors made a colossal blunder in their choice the country might have a despot saddled upon it for six long years, whereas at present the most unsatisfactory President would not have to be endured longer than four years. If so disposed, a President might inflict incalculable damage upon the country; yet upon the Chief Executive, as upon every other official or department of the Government, there are certain constitutional checks, and as a last recourse a President, for good and sufficient cause, may at any time be impeached during his term of office, whether it be long or short.

In favor of a single long term, without possibility of renomination or reelection, there are decided advantages. Six years is long enough for a President to map out and to carry to successful completion a constructive national policy. Again, the periods of upheaval and unsettling so disastrous to the business interests of the country as a whole will be put two years further apart. Presidential year is always an "off" year. These "off" years should be separated as far as practicable.

Perhaps the greatest advantage of all is that a single term would insure a more fearless and disinterested service from the occupant of the presidential chair. Every President desires a reelection as a mark of approval of his administration, and hardly is he inducted into office before he begins to lay plans to secure another nomination. Though

every move he makes may be perfectly honorable, his usefulness to the country as a whole is, in a measure, lessened by this desire for another term. Just as we always expect better results from a President's second term than from his first, so we would expect the best of which he was capable in a single long term.

[From The Tribune, New York City.]

The wide approval given to the suggestion of a single presidential term is gratifying to The Tribune, which is earnestly desirous of seeing an end put to the embarrassments of a situation compelling a President to consider a renomination at the hands of his party as an indispensable endorsement of the merit of his first administration. Many men of prominence in this community have given their support to the single-term movement on the ground that its success would relieve the President of an unenviable obligation to court the favor of politicians in control of the party machinery and leave him free, if the term were extended to six years, to develop his policies with less distracting interference from them and the officeholders and office seekers whom they principally represent.

If a President only served a single term and was ineligible for reelection, it would be much easier to carry through such an admirable plan as that of Mr. Taft for the extension of the classified service so as to cover all postmasters, collectors, registers, surveyors, and other higher grade employees whose offices are now considered legitimate party patronage. A President would have no inducement to select Federal officers with a view of getting their assistance in a campaign for renomination, could choose them for merit only, and insist that they keep out of partisan politics.

The responsibilities of the President have multiplied so rapidly in recent years and the labor thrust upon him is now so enormous that he ought to be allowed to give all his time and energy to the public business, with no thought for the thousand details of the process of paving the way for his own renomination and reelection. Mr. Taft, who has been noted for his neglect to take advantage of political opportunities, has properly complained of the useless strain put upon the President by forcing him to appoint and reappoint thousands of officers who should be selected by the competitive method and put under the protection of the classified service. When the second-term tradition is got rid of the President will be able to devote himself completely to his official duties and become more than ever a constructive force in administration and legislation and the leader not only of his own party but of the voters, without regard to party. Freed from the shackles of partisanship, he can become the President of all parties and all sections, as the framers of the Constitution wisely intended him to be.

Opposition to a single term is nowhere active and aggressive, and the adoption of a one-term amendment can be delayed only by lack of initiative and the too-prevalent disposition to think that the Constitution can be and should be amended only in times of stress and disturbances. It can be changed just as easily in an era of tranquillity, and all that is necessary to get the reform under way is to force action in Congress on a resolution which has already been reported favorably in each House.

Prominent men who have expressed opinions favoring a six-year term, with ineligibility for reelection, as advocated by the Tribune, are: Silas W. Burt, president of the Civil Service Reform Association; Frederick W. Whitledge, receiver of the Third Avenue Railway; Frederick R. Coudert, the lawyer; George M. Miller, president of St. Luke's Hospital; William Nelson Cromwell, the lawyer; Otto Bannard, the banker; Paul M. Warburg, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; William R. Wilcox, chairman of the Public Service Commission; Samuel H. Ordway, president of the Civil Service Reform League; William Jay Schieffelin, president of the Citizens' Union; Benjamin F. Tracy, of the Manhattan Life Insurance Co.; J. Hampden Dougherty, the lawyer; Charles H. Strong, president of the City Club; Adolph Lewisohn, president of the General Development Co.; Eugene A. Philbin, formerly district attorney of New York County; Hugh Hastings, former State historian; Charles J. Peabody, of Brooklyn; Welding Ring, former president of the Produce Exchange; Edward Lauterbach, former member of the board of regents; and Henry R. Towne, president of the Merchants' Association.

[From the Sun, New York City.]

The joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a single term of six years for President, which is to come before the House of Representatives and the United States Senate on the reassembling of those bodies, is known as the Clayton resolution, being named after Representative HENRY D. CLAYTON, of Alabama, and reads:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of six years; and no person who has held the office by election, or who has acted as President under the Constitution or any law made in pursuance thereof, shall ever again be eligible to hold said office."

The resolution includes the Vice President.

[From the Press, Utica, N. Y.]

Naturally enough there is a renewal of the discussion of the six-year one-term proposition. Now, as always before, there has seemed to be more arguments for than against it. Until human nature can be very materially changed, that seems to be the best possible solution of what is otherwise bound to be a perplexing problem. It is not at all liable that any man would be elected President of the United States who was unworthy or unable satisfactorily to complete a six-year term. In fact, the last four would probably be better than the first two years, for experience is worth a great deal, especially in an office of this kind, and that is one of the arguments advanced in favor of a second term. Under the present system the man who fails to be renominated is looked upon as having been discarded by his party, and the man who, being renominated, fails of reelection is looked upon as having been discarded by the whole people. Accordingly renomination and reelection are considered essential to a satisfactory reputation and standing in history.

In order to get the renomination there is an irresistible temptation to do certain things and leave certain things undone for the express purpose of getting votes or to acquire personal popularity. There is only one standard by which a President ought to judge every question which comes before him, and that is as to whether it is right and best for the general welfare. If he considers his own or his party's interest in that connection he is doing the people an injustice. Many a man has had a good appointment under a President for no other reason than that it would strengthen the Executive in this or that State.

The public service has been the loser by that operation. When a man knows that he will not be eligible for renomination he will endeavor to make the best possible record for himself, and indeed will be determined to do it. Knowing that doing right will not lose him a delegate he will have no temptation to do anything else. His chief end, aim, and ambition will be to make an honorable record, which will deserve and have an honorable place for all time in American history. That is as it ought to be and of itself constitutes a reason.

[From the Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio.]

A resolution providing for a constitutional amendment to change the presidential term from four to six years and to make the President ineligible for reelection will soon come up for action in the Senate.

Only one argument approaching validity has been urged against the amendment. This is that the spread of popular-preference presidential primaries throughout the Union will largely do away with the evils incident to a presidential campaign for renomination and reelection.

To some extent this contention is correct. The shameless use of patronage which has been customary will be of no avail in future pre-convention campaign if the popular primary plan is generally adopted. The steam roller can roll conventions flat, but it can not crush the expression of popular sentiment. If popular preference is to become the accepted plan of presidential nomination a large part of the evil of the campaign for a second term will be eliminated.

Enough will remain, however, to make desirable the enactment of the single-term amendment. Even though a President is not busily engaged in oiling the patronage steam roller he will have his eyes constantly fixed on the second-term goal. He will be tempted to shape his policies to catch the popular fancy, regardless of his own convictions. He can not forget the popular primary any more than he can the balloting in November. He will be working first for popularity within his party and afterwards for popularity in the Nation.

A President who spends much effort to gain popular adulation is not likely to be the most useful executive. A President who assumes office with a six-year term ahead of him and with no possibility of reelection may proceed to give the Nation the best there is in him without fear and without favor.

Popular-preference primaries will go far toward nullifying the utility of the patronage steam roller. The single-term amendment will remove the President from the temptation of playing partisan politics. Both are desirable. Neither should be put aside because the other seems likely of enforcement.

[From the Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio.]

The single-term idea is not directed against any man or party. There is nothing "political" in it in the ordinary and superficial sense of the word. It is inspired by the higher and purer conceptions of government and service.

Those who favor a single term of proper length—six or perhaps even eight years—do so because they wish to insure single-minded devotion to good government at all times in the White House, because they wish to remove temptation and pressure, to enable the President to deal with measures, issues, and men strictly on their merits.

Properly presented and explained the advanced single-term idea can not fail to commend itself to progressive and sober-minded citizens.

[From The Journal, Columbus, Ohio.]

In both Houses of Congress the resolution to amend the Constitution by making the presidential term six years and no more has been indorsed by both Judiciary Committees. Now, the matter ought to be pushed to a vote and settled. There is no doubt the people favor the one-term idea. It is hardly a proposition to be argued.

Glorious for the Nation would it be if a President should be elected only every six years. And great would the presidency be if it did not have to think of a reelection.

[From The Journal, Hamilton, Ohio.]

That single term of six years for President has great possibilities. Therefore it is going to win by constitutional amendment.

[From The Sun, Springfield, Ohio.]

President Taft embraced a popular cause when he declared for a six-year term for the President of the United States and a legal bar to reelection. This will do away with much of the uncertainty in national affairs just previous to the national conventions, and will undoubtedly make for better results in the Executive office.

Under the present system the last year of every presidential term where the President is a candidate for the renomination and reelection is given over to political activities rather than to the duties of the office. The President's mind is taken up with schemes to further his own political ambitions. His subordinates dependent upon their chief retaining his place to hold their positions also give of their time to building up party fences. The holders of the many appointive places in the Federal service also are on the alert to serve the prevailing party and are unable to give the proper attention to their routine work.

The official business of the Nation is neglected for a period of almost a year preceding every national election. Following the election comes a period of readjustment, especially if the rival party has prevailed and new incumbents are appointed to the places.

In the days just preceding the election it is impossible to secure beneficial legislation. Everything is tainted with politics. The party in power refuses to pass any measure which is not available for campaign purposes, and the opposition steadfastly opposes any good measure for fear that it may be used in support of the plans of the rival party.

This condition is unsatisfactory. It seems that the people are entitled to have faithful impartial service from the men they have elevated to office and for whose salaries a good percentage of the taxes is required. Yet, from the very nature of the present system, it is impossible to receive but a minor part of the efforts of the first termers during the pre-election year.

In his speech Saturday night, President Taft has pointed one way of ending the present conditions. A six-year term, without possibility of reelection, would give the administration five years to work after the first year of readjustment. It would be possible for the President and his subordinates to expend their energy in making a record for efficiency rather than for expert political moves. With the heads of the departments demanding efficiency rather than political service the work of the men holding subordinate places would be correspondingly improved. The natural tendency of the inferiors would be to hold onto their places

through good work rather than hazard their positions in the hope of securing a better under the next administration.

Four years is too short a time for the great national policies to be worked out. The work would be scarcely under way before another administration would begin; but under the six-year term it would be possible to carry out a consistent policy to a successful termination. Many bits of good legislation have been prevented because the term of the legislators ended before they had reached a vote, and a new party, with new policies, effectually prevented any attempt to pass it.

The new system is gaining in favor with all parties. Various public men have from time to time advocated the establishment of a six-year term for Presidents, and it would not be surprising if some action was taken to lengthen the term of the President following Wilson.

[From the Courier, Zanesville, Ohio.]

If the Constitution is amended to limit the tenure of the presidential chair to one term of six years, the office will be placed where it ought to be—above the plane of politics—and its incumbent will be free to act without personal fear of the political consequences. President Taft favors the idea and President Elect Wilson has so expressed himself in the past. The people, we believe, would indorse the proposition if given the opportunity.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg.]

To forbid reelection of a President implies no distrust of the people beyond that which the people have of themselves. The whole Constitution is a body of limitations, placed by the people themselves on the exercise of their undisputed power. This would be but an added limitation adopted by the people of their own free will.

The danger to the national interests through a change of Presidents in a time of crisis such as existed during the Civil War is too remote to be a serious factor. The people can be relied upon to elect a new President who will carry on those policies of a retiring President which they approve.

The people need fewer elections and their public servants need to be freed from the disturbing influence of frequent campaigns. With a six-year term and with ineligibility we should have longer periods of calm, better service, more continuity of policy, and wider interest in elections when they do come.

[From the Gazette, Altoona, Pa.]

The single six-year term would emancipate the President and increase his power and prestige. He would and could sign or veto bills without thinking of "votes," and the pressure of spoilsmen and practical politicians would be largely removed; self-respect, firmness, dignity, conscientious devotion to duty would be immensely strengthened and exalted by the change.

[From the American, Mahanoy City, Pa.]

President Taft was not the first citizen to advocate the amendment of the Federal Constitution so as to extend the presidential term from four to six years, making the occupant of the office ineligible for reelection. Others have spoken in favor of such a change, and a good many thoughtful citizens favor it.

They are opposed to the quadrennial agitation of the country hitherto inevitable to a national campaign. They think it injures business and gives Americans a bad reputation among their cousins on the other side of the seas. And then it is generally believed that freedom from ambition to succeed himself would enable a President to serve his country better than would be the case if he were moved by a desire to be his own successor.

The ordinary public officer who is eligible to succeed himself is likely to keep an eye on his chances and to move with a caution born of ambition. We suspect a one-term President generally would be more efficient than one who spent much time scheming to succeed himself.

[From the Press, Philadelphia, Pa.]

Whatever else the Congress in its expiring session shall do or leave undone, the resolution pending in the Senate looking to the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, providing for the extension of the presidential term to six years and making the incumbent ineligible for reelection ought to be favorably acted upon. There is no question such an amendment would be adopted by every State in the Union. It would greatly add to the efficiency and independence of the President if his conduct in office were unbiased by any consideration other than the advancement of the public interest. It would end at once and for good both second and third term demagoguery, with the implied drift toward one-man power and an abandonment of representative government. The danger of prolonging the incumbency of an unfit or dangerous man, who should be chosen to the Presidency through extension of the term of office, is sufficiently guarded against by the reservation of the power of impeachment in case of need.

[From the Evening Telegraph, Philadelphia, Pa.]

To lengthen the presidential term to six years and limit it to a single period meets with our hearty approval. The question should no longer be left to the flexible interpretation of mere unwritten precedents, but a definite settlement of it should be incorporated in the Constitution in the form of a necessary and legal amendment. The lengthening and limiting of the term would give any ambitious President a long enough time to shape his policies and test them by experience, and would remove the temptation from such to ask for a second term on a specious plea and secure it by a questionable use of Executive patronage.

[From the Dispatch, York, Pa.]

Contrary to a very general impression, the proposal to limit the presidential tenure to a single term is not new. At the very beginning of the Republic, when the great statesmen of that period were struggling with the mighty problems before them, the matter of the presidential term was a much-discussed and vexing theme. All sorts of suggestions were offered, ranging from life tenure to a single term of four years. When it was finally decided to make the presidential term four years, with eligibility for reelection, a single vote in the convention was the determining factor.

The great advantage to the country in limiting the presidential tenure to a single term of six years would be the enabling of the President to devote all his time to his official duties. Every President would know that he had but one term in which to perfect his policies and

carry them out, and he would not be distracted from his purpose by the necessity of laying plans for reelection almost from the day of his inauguration. Each President would have the courage to do what he believed was right, unembarrassed by the threats of his enemies that they would "beat him for reelection." A President would be in large measure exempt from the attacks of his enemies within the party, and at the expiration of his term he would retire to private life with indifference as to whether or not he had played the political game to the satisfaction of the politicians.

[From the Gazette, York, Pa.]

The question of a single term for President of the United States is certain to be discussed exhaustively, if not exhaustively, in the next few years. By its platform the Democratic Party is bound to take action in that direction, and in doing so it will be indorsed by a majority of the citizens of all parties. The phase of this question about which there is going to be the most debate is what the length of the term should be. There have been some who argued that it should be eight years. Now, however, it is generally conceded that this would be too long. Six years or four years seem to be the popular limits.

Those who argue in favor of the shorter term say that four years are plenty long enough for a good man and that six years would be altogether too long for a poor man to occupy the presidential chair. All of this latter part of the contention may be granted. But would not even two years be too long for an unfit President? It was the original intention of the founders of the Government to have short terms. Jefferson in a letter quotes that maxim of that day as being "Where annual election ends, tyranny begins." That, of course, would be a practical application of genuine democracy, the theory of government not necessarily the policy of the Democratic Party, but it will be granted by all that our country is too large for it to work out successfully. Massachusetts elects State officers annually, and even in that small State the frequency of the important elections is becoming burdensome.

So that it is plain we must look for some other way out of the difficulty. It is clear that the annual election of President is out of the question, and the eight-year term would be too long. It is true that six years would be too long for an unfit President, and so would four years. It seems, then, that the best way to settle the matter is to make sure of the right man and the right platform, and then give him time enough to thoroughly try out the policies for which he stands. If this is done, there can be little valid objection to a six-year term, and there can be little question that this is none too long to work out important policies.

Another thing should be borne in mind—the people are beginning to weary of the frequent and strenuous campaigns. There is danger that this may result in such an increasing indifference that it will be easier than it now is for incompetent and even dangerous men to be "put over" by scheming interests who look upon "practical" politics as a part of their business game. This must be reckoned with. Less frequent elections and a more thorough stirring up of interest in the campaigns seems the best solution.

Furthermore, it would be a great gain if this could be so arranged that the State elections could be held during those years when there were no national elections. Suppose, for example, that our Presidents were elected every six years and the Members of the Lower House of Congress every three years, so that a congressional election would come in the middle of the presidential term, as now. That would give all the States ample opportunity to arrange their elections at times when there would be no complications with national problems. Would not this result in better government all around? We believe it would.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn.]

There is a growing inclination on the part of the public toward the six-year term. There are sensible reasons why such a term should be established instead of the brief four years now allotted to the President.

Everyone will admit that nothing so disturbs the commercial welfare of the country as an election. From ocean to ocean the States have been disturbed for the past two months, and will be until November.

A political campaign, even over a local issue, disturbs business. Brothers turn against brothers, fathers against their sons, over politics. The real truth is that we have too much of this sort of thing, and if it is not a presidential campaign it is another, with its turmoil and excitement.

Each President elected has entered office with the determination to do the best he could for the country. We have had no bad men in office. Our Presidents, irrespective of party, have been men of class. They have lived up to the platforms upon which they were elected as far as possible. No President has ever been associated with any graft scheme, and all have been practically free from the taint of scandal. It stands to reason that only men of the highest character present themselves for such an exalted office. Men of the highest character are elected, and the country has prospered under every President we have had since the days of George Washington.

It is safe to trust anyone who can secure the indorsement of the people, and if he is elected for six or eight years instead of four, so much the better. As it is, scarcely does a President get comfortably seated in office than it is necessary to run again. This keeps the country upset. No one can rest easily during a campaign. It is more uncertain in some States than in others. There is always an element of uncertainty in a campaign. No one can say what the outcome will be or what the effect on the country will be. Wall Street holds the balance of power. It can create a panic or quell one. Wall Street is always uneasy during a campaign, and while the street is uneasy so is the country.

With fewer elections the country would be better off, and with a longer presidential term there would be a smaller opportunity for strife and unsettled business conditions.

[From the News, Wheeling, W. Va.]

From all indications an attempt will be made at the next session of Congress to change the tenure of office for the President of the United States from a term of four years to a single term of six years.

The change will necessitate an amendment to the Constitution, and will entail no little inconvenience. However, it seems to be a good idea.

At present the length of a presidential term is four years. A man may succeed himself as many times as he is able to secure the nomination and election, although custom makes it bad form to ask for another after one has served two terms.

A man is elected for a term of four years. During this time all of his actions are usually directed so that he will be able to secure a second nomination and election. His actions are "a play to the galleries," as it were. During his first term his time is so taken up by this "gallery play" that he is likely to neglect many of his duties

and act contrary to the way he would act if his tenure were restricted to a single term.

During this term the members of the Cabinet, who owe their office to appointment from the Executive, play politics along with their chief. At the end of the first four years there is a possibility of defeat for the candidate for reelection.

If the tenure of office were made a single term of six years, the administration would undoubtedly be made more efficient. The time would be long enough to give a good Executive an opportunity to put into effect his policies and not long enough to permit an incapable Executive to harm the country.

The change is a good one. Think it over.

[From the Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va.]

Presidential elections come too often, and Presidents too frequently play politics. A four-year term hardly enables a President to institute and carry through an established line of policy, and eligibility for reelection tempts him to try to secure reelection. As a rule, the first two years of a President's administration are given up to getting acquainted with his job, and the second two years are filled with efforts to secure another term. Lengthening the President's term and forbidding reelection would place the office of the Presidency on a higher plane and insure a higher grade of public service.

[From the Chicago Evening Post, Tuesday, Oct. 25, 1904.]

REVELL FOR SIX YEARS—CHICAGO MAN URGES THAT THE TERM OF PRESIDENT SHOULD BE LIMITED—TELLING POINTS ARE MADE—SPEECH GIVEN AT OPENING OF COMMERCIAL CONGRESS AT ST. LOUIS.

ST. LOUIS, October 25.

The opening session of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress was held here to-day in Convention Hall at the World's Fair. The congress will continue the remainder of the week.

Alexander H. Revell, of Chicago, vice president of the National Business League, delivered an address on the question of a single six-year term for President of the United States.

The feature of the opening session was the large attendance of visitors, showing the general interest in the proceedings. During the sessions of the congress, which will continue through Saturday, matters of importance to residents of the trans-Mississippi region will be discussed, such as irrigation, good roads, river navigation, and interstate-commerce laws.

Following the invocation by Rev. Michael Burnham, of St. Louis, the meeting was called to order by the chairman of the executive committee, Thomas Richardson, of Portland, Oreg. In a short introductory address, Mr. Richardson presented the president of the congress, R. C. Kerens, of St. Louis.

ADDRESS OF MR. REVELL.

Mr. Revell spoke as follows:

"The National Business League has started a movement to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will fix the term of office of the President at six years instead of four years. At the same time, and by the same amendment, it is proposed to make the President ineligible to reelection.

"I am not aware that anyone questions the expediency of the proposed change. Indeed, so far as I can learn, all admit that the changes proposed would be sound public policy. It is perhaps true that those who are engaged in politics for diversion or for profit may be lukewarm in the effort to prolong the period between elections. But it is not likely that the politician—the man who is trying to be politic and responsive to public demands—will interpose to prevent an admittedly needed and popular amendment.

"All things considered it may be accepted that the sentiment of the country is such that the amendment may be secured upon the presentation of the proper arguments to the electors and those who as officials may be instrumentalities in bringing it about. The labor that is before us consists in pulling together and putting in order the half-formulated latent sentiment in regard to the proposed amendment. It is this labor which the National Business League has undertaken to perform. It is to this endeavor that all right-minded electors are expected to extend courageous and industrious assistance.

"No reasonable objection can be raised against the lengthening of the President's term of office.

"As things now are there is, in fact, only about three years of settled conditions, and many would acknowledge only two years. The fourth year is given up to the campaign. In fact, it is only during the first two years of the presidential term that business, and that word does not mean the great capitalists only, can feel that conditions are settled. Along toward the end of the term the policy which the President has pursued is used by the opposition on which to unite in order to create an 'issue' for the oncoming campaign. The effect of all this is that business becomes more or less gambling against the chances of the presidential succession.

"LOOK TO THE GOVERNMENT.

"There is a growing tendency in this, and indeed in all countries, to look upon the government or the administration as the cause of the prosperity or adversity of the people. This tendency disposes the people to look more and more to the government as the author of their conditions. Demagogues, selfishly and ignorantly finding this tendency to exist, endeavor from time to time to arouse the voter into active hostility against the administration. He endeavors to convince his too easily persuaded auditors that a change of administration policy, especially in relation to the currency or the tariff, we will say, will change their fortunes from bad to good.

"The effect of this is that during any presidential term and under any policy which may be put into practice there are those who are disposed to find fault with it and to create an impression that exactly the opposite policy would be more in the interest of the general public. At times this sort of criticism results in the formation of parties predicated on propositions to squarely reverse the policy which is being put into practice by the sitting President and to put into operation an entirely opposite policy.

"The effect of this condition of things is to present to the business man a situation in which two distinctly opposite policies are proposed. He can make no calculations for the future, and he must hold in abeyance many of his enterprises and curtail his business until he finds out what is going to be done—what the result of the election will be.

"This condition of suspense operates to depress business and intensify adverse conditions, or at least to modify the benefits of the administrative policy which may be in practice at the time. The element of unwarranted doubt operates to bring about changes of policies

and Presidents, changes that are in themselves unwarranted and possibly harmful.

"NOT FAIR TO JUDGE BY.

"This presidential year is hardly a fair one to judge by. It is the most prosperous presidential year in 44 years, and perhaps for a longer period. This would hardly be the time or place, and it is not essential that we discuss all the reasons for this. While the year has been phenomenal as an election year, and with the splendid agricultural and financial situation, still there has been a pronounced flimidity among business men in regard to inaugurating new business enterprises.

"Also there has been and is very general complaint, especially in manufacturing industries. Hence, the question naturally arises, Would not the year 1904 have been a record-breaking year had there been no presidential election?

"A longer term for the President would not only create a longer period of business security, but it would give ample time for a President to formulate and carry out his policies. Very often presidential administrative plans can not be put into operation and the benefits of them realized by the general public before the time for another campaign approaches. In other words, the presidential term of four years is too brief for a President to inaugurate and carry out a policy. A six-year term would give ample time.

"Another thing, the election of a President for six years would have a tendency to silence those agitators who preach discontent and advise the people to look forward to the next presidential election as the time when they could make a change which would repair their grievances. Six years would be too long to look ahead. With a six-year term the country would settle down to calmness and steadiness in business, which is unknown under the present four-year term.

"By making the President ineligible to succeed himself he would be enabled to leave politics behind when he took the oath of office. He could direct his efforts to being a good President. The record of a President would then merit careful comparison.

"By gradual growth it has come to be an unwritten law that a President is expected to succeed himself. It is expected that his second election will be a 'vindication' of his first term of office. There is no question about this fact. For a President to decline to be a candidate for reelection after having served a four-year term would be taken to mean that he believed that he could not be reelected.

"In other words, a failure to demand renomination would be accepted as a confession of the failure of him and his party to properly administer the Government.

"Thus it is incumbent on a President at the end of his term to again become a candidate for reelection even if he does not want to, and, in a measure, his party must renominate him even if he did not want renomination. As a matter of fact, this condition of things has practically established that the presidential service of a man is eight years.

"MUST KEEP IN FAVOR.

"This fact that the President must secure renomination and reelection compels him so to conduct and warp his administrative policies that he will remain in favor with the politicians who are to renominate him and also to cater to the more transient popular sentiment. No President since Washington that we know of has ever acted differently. No man, as mankind goes, can be expected to be at his best under such condition of things. He may fairly be expected to be at his worst. Poor human nature is not such that Presidents may be expected to crucify themselves for the unappreciated welfare of their supporters.

"Representative Gaines, of Tennessee, has been making a historical study of the question of one term for Presidents, and points out that it was a live question with the convention that framed the Constitution and has been under discussion a good part of the time since.

"One of the greatest curses of American politics is the spoils system. By means of their appointive power, from President down to coroner, with a few exceptions, public officials aspire to succeed themselves, and as soon as they are elected utilize the patronage of office in order to pay for favors rendered in the past and expected to be obtained in the future. A President who was not by custom expected to secure a 'vindication' by reelection would not be under compulsion to use his appointive power in order to make himself secure against the next nomination and election. In short, the one-term principle would tend, as nothing else would tend, to eradicate the spoils system.

"Now, then, what is to be done? The Constitution of the United States says concerning the term of the President: 'He shall hold his office during the term of four years.' In relation to the matter of amendments the Constitution says:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution; or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures, three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

"TO APPEAL TO CONGRESS.

"From this it will be seen that either the State legislatures or Congress may initiate the proposition to amend the Constitution. The practice generally has been for Congress to propose and submit amendments to the several State legislatures. The same course will be pursued in this case, and Congress will be asked to propose an amendment making the presidential term to be six years and the President ineligible to reelection.

"The endeavor of the National Business League will be to make it apparent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress that the people actually desire that the proposed amendment be submitted to the legislatures. If this fact can be demonstrated, there is no doubt that Congress will hasten to comply with the demands of the public. Ratification in the State legislatures will be brought about by the same means. The responsiveness of our legislative bodies to the demands of business interests are always prompt and satisfactory.

"More and more the welfare of all the people is becoming and is understood to be wrapped up in and dependent upon business prosperity. To make it manifest, therefore, that the business men of the country believe and demand a presidential term of six years and no renomination of Presidents will be to assure the adoption of the amendment. The arousal of the business interests of the country, it will be seen, is the real, actual labor that is before the business league. Those who have undertaken to propagate the amendment proposition should see to it that those under them, those connected with them in business, their club fellows, their friends and customers, are fully advised of the amendment and its expected good results."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 8188) to amend section 113 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911, reported it without amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 27475) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1164) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, submitted a report (No. 1168), accompanied by a bill (S. 8314) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

- S. 602. Kate Brown.
- S. 630. James R. Haldeman.
- S. 910. Mary Francis.
- S. 923. Jane De Graw.
- S. 1012. Carrie Engberg.
- S. 1572. Sarah E. McCann.
- S. 1843. Susan M. Sumner.
- S. 1991. Mary J. Anderson.
- S. 3079. John W. Anderson.
- S. 3546. John S. Rodgers.
- S. 3550. John G. Myers.
- S. 3555. Andrew J. Furry.
- S. 3895. Charles F. Cooken.
- S. 3980. William Robertson.
- S. 3998. George W. Leslie.
- S. 4012. William H. Weber.
- S. 4014. George Ketzler.
- S. 4020. August Schurman.
- S. 4021. Samuel J. Riley.
- S. 4080. William E. Huestis.
- S. 4593. Orlina M. Cadwell.
- S. 4602. George Warnick.
- S. 5013. Louis M. Lea.
- S. 5374. Thomas F. Stevens.
- S. 5444. Darwin Zeek.
- S. 5737. David F. Stewart.
- S. 5779. Nathan Vanaman.
- S. 5941. Joseph Johnson.
- S. 5994. John N. Postlethwait.
- S. 6212. John Miller.
- S. 6261. John O. Branson.
- S. 6375. Adam P. S. Poisal.
- S. 6388. Francis M. Hanes.
- S. 6475. John L. Skinner, jr.
- S. 6639. John P. Glenn.
- S. 6642. William A. Stewart.
- S. 6643. William Turnbeaugh.
- S. 6785. Julia A. Snedeker.
- S. 6872. Martha R. Brown.
- S. 7058. Elias Redmon.
- S. 7085. George Moffatt.
- S. 7090. Kate F. Sage.
- S. 7213. Myra Van Winkle.
- S. 7236. Charles G. Glidden.
- S. 7280. Clara V. King.
- S. 7342. James Griffey.
- S. 7344. Sarah F. Boynton.
- S. 7357. Emiles Pomeroy.
- S. 7346. Fannie M. Page.
- S. 7398. Thomas Gannon.
- S. 7429. Orlan A. Hibbs.
- S. 7450. William H. Hall.
- S. 7451. William T. Francis.
- S. 7462. Marshall D. House.
- S. 7465. Henry McClure.
- S. 7471. Mary J. Wood.
- S. 7496. Ephraim Benedict Murphy, alias Ephraim Benedict.
- S. 7497. Jay Doty.
- S. 7553. Lorenzo F. Nolan.
- S. 7613. Erastus G. Cummings.
- S. 7786. Victoria L. McHone.
- S. 7902. Margaret L. Thompson.
- S. 8071. Daniel Hand.
- S. 8098. Horace C. Webber.
- S. 8131. Stanley H. Husted.
- S. 8145. Joseph Cassidy.
- S. 8144. William L. Sheaff.
- S. 8157. Louis C. Emmett.

S. 8158. Christian Bowman.
 S. 8159. Stephen Collier.
 S. 8160. Baxter Johnson.
 S. 8163. Mary E. Allen.
 S. 8173. Georgiana Packard.
 S. 8187. Josephine E. Miller.
 S. 8201. Delia H. Austin.
 S. 8203. Wendell P. Hood.
 S. 8206. Lucy Gamble.
 S. 8208. Elizabeth Croft.
 S. 8213. Stephen B. Johnson.
 S. 8237. Ferdinand O. Tension.
 S. 8239. Thomas Moody.
 S. 8240. Charles Belknap.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4241) to encourage rifle practice and promote a patriotic spirit among the citizens and youth of the United States, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1165) thereon.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 110) to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in Todd and Bennett Counties, in the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1166) thereon.

YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. WORKS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 8279) to amend an act approved October 1, 1890, entitled "An act to set apart certain tracts of land in the State of California as forest reservations," and I submit a report (No. 1163) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOLDIERS' HOME AT SANTA MONICA, CAL.

Mr. JONES. Under Senate resolution 160 the Committee on Military Affairs or a subcommittee thereof was directed to make an investigation of the management of the Branch National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and Sailors at Santa Monica, Cal. A subcommittee was appointed in pursuance of the resolution and made the investigation and submitted its findings and recommendations.

By direction of the full committee I submit the report of the subcommittee (Rept. No. 1167), together with a bill to transfer the Pacific Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the War Department, recommended by it. In doing so, I will state that the bill is reported with the recommendation of the subcommittee for such action and consideration as the Senate may desire to take upon it, and it is not to be understood as being recommended by the full Committee on Military Affairs. I ask that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 8297) to transfer the Pacific Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the War Department was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will take the liberty of inquiring of the Senator from Washington whether the bill should not be referred to the committee.

Mr. JONES. The resolution directed the committee or a subcommittee to report the facts and their findings to the Senate. Under the peculiar language of the resolution, I think the bill should go to the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SANDERS:

A bill (S. 8298) to provide for the enlargement of the Federal building at Chattanooga, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 8299) to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," approved March 1, 1911.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To what committee does the Senator from Tennessee desire to have the bill referred?

Mr. SANDERS. The Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is disposed to refer it to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources.

Mr. SANDERS. It is really a water-power bill. I think it should go to the Committee on Commerce, but I am not sure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 8300) to provide for the admission in evidence of certificates of the heads of executive departments and independent executive establishments to show the nonemployment of persons brought to trial under section 32 of the act of March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 8301) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Nichols (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 8302) to provide for the erection of a public building at Naugatuck, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 8303) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Bentley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 8304) for the relief of Rodger Caplette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON:

A bill (S. 8305) to promote and encourage the building of modern public highways by granting aid thereto under certain conditions; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 8306) to amend an act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 19, 1906, as amended by the act approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 8307) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Strayer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 8308) granting a pension to Joseph H. Mayo (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 8309) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 8310) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River opposite the town of Newport, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 8311) providing for a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the country at the time of the American Revolution (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 8312) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at the city of Union Springs, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 8313) to provide for the erection of a public building at Williamson, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. McLEAN submitted an amendment providing for a survey to secure the increased depth of the harbor at Stamford, Conn., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States \$10,000 on deposit to the credit of the Creek Indians and pay it to the trustees of the Henry Kendall College, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make a per capita payment of \$200 from the tribal trust funds of the Seminole Indians to each individual officially enrolled as a member of that tribe, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which

was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for improving the Willamette River, Oreg., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment providing for the purchase of subsistence supplies for all vessels in harbor-boat service not otherwise provided for, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$20,000 for the erection and completion of a hospital building and equipment at Pima Agency, Ariz., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$60,000 for the purchase of not less than 600 acres of land convenient to the city of Washington, D. C., to be used for target-practice purposes, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON submitted an amendment providing for a survey of the Leipsic River, Del., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

CONNECTICUT RIVER DAM.

Mr. JONES. I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 8033) to authorize the Connecticut River Co. to relocate and construct a dam across the Connecticut River, and so forth. I ask that it be read and lie on the table.

The proposed amendment was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JONES to the bill (S. 8033) to authorize the Connecticut River Co. to relocate and construct a dam across the Connecticut River above the village of Windsor Locks, in the State of Connecticut, viz: Strike out all of section 1 after the words "And provided further," in line 19, page 2, and insert the following:

"The assent of Congress herein given shall not be complete and operative until there shall be filed with the Secretary of War an agreement signed by the said Connecticut River Co. and the proper authorities of the State of Connecticut in which is recognized and acknowledged the full authority of the State of Connecticut to supervise, regulate, and control the rates to be charged by said company, its successors and assigns, for the energy developed; and the right of said State from time to time to readjust such rates; and the right of said State to supervise, regulate, and control said corporation, its successors or assigns, its management, stocks, bonds, or evidences of indebtedness in such manner as may be provided from time to time by the laws of said State; and the right of said State to exact from said corporation, its successors or assigns, such annual charges as may be just and reasonable, taking into account the amount spent and required to be spent by said corporation in improving the navigation of said river and the right of said corporation to a reasonable return on the fair value of such dam and appurtenances, works and property, allowing for the cost of construction, maintenance, and renewal.

PUNISHMENT OF MURDER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JONES submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the President be requested to return the bill (S. 7162) to amend section 801 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

HARBOR REGULATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1072) to amend section 895 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, which were, on page 2, line 10, to strike out "ice, snow," and insert "or," and on page 2, line 10, to strike out "or trash."

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 23939. An act to legalize titles in the District of Columbia to certain citizens was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 28180. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR DAVIS.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent to dispose of a merely formal matter, Senate resolution 425, au-

thorizing the Secretary of the Senate to pay the actual expenses incurred by the committee attending the funeral of the late Senator JEFF DAVIS. It will take only the time to read it.

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President of the Senate pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of the late Senator JEFF DAVIS, from the State of Arkansas, vouchers for the same to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CAMPAIGN PURPOSES.

Mr. JONES. I ask the Senate to consider Senate resolution 418, amending Senate resolution 79, in regard to the investigation of campaign contributions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution named by him.

The resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate resolution 79, agreed to August 26, 1912, be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting, on line 2, page 2, of said resolution, after the word "eight," the words "November 5, 1912."

PROPOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As a substitute for that motion, I move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of House bill 22871, to establish extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That motion is not in order under the rule. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas and Mr. SMITH of Georgia called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when Mr. BACON's name was called). I desire to state that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is detained at home by sickness in his family.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MASSEY]. I desire this announcement to stand on each vote for the day. I vote "yea."

Mr. THORNTON (when Mr. FOSTER's name was called). I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. FOSTER] on account of illness in his family, and ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GARDNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. I desire to transfer that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PAYNTER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM]. He seems not to have voted. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and vote. I vote "yea." I make this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably absent from the city. I desire this statement to stand for the day.

Mr. KERN (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness.

While I am on my feet I desire to transfer my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], instead of to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], as previously announced.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. SANDERS. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], with whom I am paired, has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Then I will withdraw my vote, having a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE], who is absent from the Chamber. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted in the negative). I desire to inquire if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that that Senator has not voted.

Mr. CULBERSON. As I have a general pair with him, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (after having voted in the negative). I voted upon entering the Chamber just now, but I am informed that a pair had previously been transferred to me. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a moment ago I announced my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and transferred it to the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], who was not then present. I wish now to withdraw the transfer, so as to give the Senator from Maine an opportunity to vote, and also to withdraw my vote, and to stand paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Under that statement I vote "nay."

Mr. STEPHENSON entered the Chamber, and voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], to whom I transferred my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], having voted, I withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will ask that the vote be again recapitulated, there having been several changes.

The Secretary recapitulated the vote.

Mr. CULBERSON. I desire to inquire if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is paired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no information on the subject.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Chair could probably secure it from the Secretary.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is paired with me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon, it has just been stated, is paired.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, a Senator sitting by me suggests that the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] was called on the roll call. Is that a fact?

Mr. OLIVER. My name was called on the roll call, but I transferred my pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and voted.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Brandegee	Cummins	McCumber	Sanders
Brown	Gallinger	McLean	Smoot
Burnham	Gamble	Nelson	Stephenson
Burton	Gronna	Oliver	Sutherland
Catron	Jackson	Page	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Perkins	Wetmore
Crawford	Kenyon	Richardson	Works
Cullom	Lodge	Root	

NAYS—31.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Myers	Shively
Bristow	Johnson Me.	O'Gorman	Simmons
Bryan	Johnston, Ala.	Overman	Smith, Ariz.
Chilton	Johnston, Tex.	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Percy	Swanson
Fletcher	La Follette	Perky	Thomas
Gardner	Martin, Va.	Poindexter	Thornton
Helskell	Martine, N. J.	Pomerene	

NOT VOTING—33.

Bacon	Culberson	Lea	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Curtis	Lippitt	Stone
Borah	Dillingham	Massey	Tillman
Bourne	Dixon	Newlands	Warren
Bradley	du Pont	Paynter	Watson
Briggs	Fall	Penrose	Williams
Chamberlain	Foster	Reed	
Clapp	Gore	Smith, Md.	
Crane	Guggenheim	Smith, Mich.	

So the Senate refused to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 22871, known as the agricultural extension departments bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 22871) to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senate that it is exceedingly important to act to-day upon this bill, together with the amendments thereto. Tomorrow we take up the constitutional amendment under unanimous consent, and following that the bill of the Senator from Vermont (S. 3) would come up as an original proposition. The friends of that measure well understand that if it should be passed independently of the House measure it would go to the House, would be referred to a committee, and there would be practically no chance to pass any part of it at this session of Congress. On the other hand, if we add to the House bill such portions of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont as we have perfected, the amendments would go at once to the House with the House bill, and necessarily would receive consideration. The House might decline to accept them immediately, and then a conference might be necessary. But before the conference committee we would have an opportunity of considering the amendments presented by the Senator from Vermont and adopted by the Senate, and out of this conference we could hope for legislation.

It is therefore exceedingly important to act on this measure to-day, while the House bill is before the Senate, and before Senate bill No. 3—the original bill of the Senator from Vermont—is reached. It will be reached immediately following the consideration of the constitutional amendment by unanimous consent.

I want to suggest to the friends of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont a few modifications of it. I wish very much that the Senator from Vermont were in his place, in order that we might have his consideration of these suggestions.

Mr. PAGE entered the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will take the liberty of repeating, since the return of the Senator from Vermont, what I have just said: It is extremely important, if we are to pass any of the provisions contained in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, that we should have action to-day, as to-morrow we take up the constitutional amendment under unanimous consent, and immediately following that the original bill of the Senator from Vermont will come up. If we should act upon that original bill, there would be no chance for legislation at this session.

I think it unwise to send to the House, as an amendment to the House bill, all of the provisions presented by the Senator from Vermont. They involve an appropriation of \$13,000,000. They involve so much new matter that we could hardly hope to obtain for them thoughtful consideration. Yet if we should take about three of them, instead of all six, and send them to the House, there would not be such a volume of them as to almost deter the mind from undertaking to consider them. If we would take his section 11, making the appropriation to secondary schools that have established distinct industrial or trades departments, and pass it, omitting section 10; if we would take, then, his appropriation to agricultural high schools, and pass it; if we would take his appropriation to normal

schools, and pass it, those three simple and distinct propositions sent to the House could be readily brought to the attention of Members of the House, and I think there would be much more hope of accomplishing something.

I have been continuously working upon this matter whenever I have had an opportunity; and I think we could make a few amendments, by eliminating a part of the measure for the present, and pass it. With those eliminations, I am ready to vote for it, and I am ready to help try to pass it through the House.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. PAGE. I shall be very glad, indeed, to have the valuable assistance of the Senator from Georgia in perfecting my bill in any way that seems to be right and best. But, as I look at the matter now, it seems to me that the provisions had better go through substantially as they appear in the original Page bill, so called, and then, out of conference, we may be able to get some results, such as have been suggested by the Senator from Georgia.

I am informed that there will be a little further discussion upon the bill this morning. Meanwhile I will give the matter consideration, and I will see the Senator from Georgia promptly about it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to give to the Senate again, very briefly, my criticisms upon the appropriation contained in section 10.

It is not limited to schools that have industrial departments. It would apply to over 13,000 schools. It would give only about \$600 to each school. It undertakes to give instruction in agriculture, in the industries, in the trades, and in household economics. I do not think anyone who has had experience with the effort to introduce industrial and trades training in a high school has failed to find that good work can not be accomplished except where there is a distinct department devoted to the work, with equipment and with appropriation sufficient really to do something.

In the case of the work in the trades and the industries, you require equipment with tools; you require separate rooms for the instruction; you require a man especially trained, who is skilled with his hands, and who also has sufficient mental equipment to give the instruction. You can not put that kind of work into a high school with one or two thousand dollars; and if you tried it, your money would simply be wasted.

The Senator's second provision, No. 11, recognizes the distinction between undertaking to introduce industrial and trades work generally in high schools and undertaking to introduce it only in those which are equipped for it, and it limits the appropriation to schools with a distinct department, where the amount of expenditure will be sufficient to amount to something.

I speak so positively upon this subject because I have seen the experiment tried. For nearly 20 years I was actively connected with the public schools of my own city. We tried the experiment of expending a small sum in each school to try to introduce industrial and trades work. At the end of a couple of years we were compelled to abandon it and to establish a distinct department of industrial and trades work, with a distinct building and with a much larger appropriation. So far as I have been able to learn, practically all educators who have been enlisted in behalf of trades and industrial work give the same report—that the money is wasted when you undertake to add it to a high school without reference to the preparedness of the high school for the work. Not only is it wasted, but it interferes with the regular work of the high school, damaging that which has been already done without introducing any new, substantial work of real value.

Mr. President, I move to strike from the amendment of the Senator from Vermont section 10.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia proposes an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 10.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia has forgotten that section 10 has been already stricken out.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A substitute for section 10 has been placed in the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. What was formerly section 3 has been substituted for the original section 10.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; that is now section 10.

Mr. CUMMINS. While I am on my feet, I desire to say that there is a great deal of force in what the Senator from Georgia has said. I prefer the old section 3 to section 10, as proposed

by the Senator from Vermont, but I would not anticipate great results from either section. While I intend to follow the Senator from Vermont in this matter, frankness compels me to say that I think the value of his bill lies in other provisions in it rather than in section 3.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to say to the Senator that I have made up my mind to support section 11. I am going to support it and vote for it.

Mr. CUMMINS. But of course section 10 has been already stricken out of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am referring to the substituted section, which is the original section 3. I am seeking to direct the bill to the high school that has an industrial department, as contained in section 11, instead of undertaking to make an appropriation to a high school which has no industrial department. If we could get it, I would put the whole \$6,000,000 into section 11 rather than to have three millions of it in section 3 and three millions of it in section 11, because from section 11 we will really get results.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have some objections, however, to the present form of section 11. I agree, however, that little can be done, under the provisions of this bill, in the general high schools of the country. But I do not think the provision should be so severe with regard to those high schools that have a department for instruction in the trades and industries and home economics. But I will refer to that later on.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the situation, the provision which the Senator from Georgia seeks to have placed in the bill is the same section that was stricken out on the motion of the Senator from Iowa. The Senate having passed upon that matter affirmatively, I hardly feel as though I could properly consent to a change now, and to a reversal of the action of the Senate, under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood the effect of the action of the Senate to be to substitute original section 3 for section 10 as the Senator from Vermont brought it in. I did not understand the action of the Senate to be a final determination that it would even retain section 3 as section 10. It was to the consideration of the advisability of concentrating our efforts on section 11, and giving what we give for industrial and trades work to schools where they have a distinct department for such work, that I was addressing myself before the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I inquire what is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion of the Senator from Georgia is to strike out section 10 from the amendment of the Senator from Vermont as amended.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I had not intended to make any observations upon this particular section of the bill. If, however, we are to take for granted everything that has been said here in regard to this particular section, then farming is indeed a limited industry.

I am somewhat surprised to hear Senators say that they are opposed to the provision for vocational education and instruction in the trades and industries and home economics because it would not better the conditions on the farm. Does any Senator mean to say that the farmer has not as much use for a vocational education or special training in the trades and home economics as those engaged in any other industry? The farmer has as much use for the trade of blacksmith or carpenter or harness maker as any of the persons engaged in those trades in the cities.

I should like to have some of these "farmers" who come from the large cities tell me what work is to be done on a farm. I have not opposed the passage of the so-called House bill. I am not saying now that I intend to oppose the passage of the House bill. But it seems to me that the farmer in the large city is more interested in the passage of this measure than are the real farmers who live on their farms.

Are we expending these millions of dollars merely for the benefit of the farmer? Have we a right to take the money, from the Treasury of the United States for the sole purpose of helping the farmer? Is it the belief of any Senator that the provisions of this bill will accomplish that very purpose?

Mr. President, you can not name a single trade embodied in this measure offered by the Senator from Vermont but what the farmer has as much use for it and it is of as much benefit to the farmer as it is for him to take hold of the plow handle and plow the ground.

Farming has indeed become very limited in its scope if nothing more is required of those engaged in it than the mere knowledge of knowing how to handle the shovel and the plow. You tell me that farming is the greatest industry in the world. I say yes; perhaps I ought not to say it, because I am a prac-

tical farmer, but I wish to say to you, sir, that the business of farming does not consist of such a limited scope as some would have us to believe. In my judgment the provisions in the bill now offered by the Senator from Vermont would ultimately be of great benefit and a great blessing not only to those engaged in the vocations and trades, but to farmers and to mankind.

Are we to make an appropriation for the farmer to teach him how to hold the plow or how to swing the ax? Do you suppose that that is the only thing to be done on a farm?

Mr. President, I am perhaps as much interested in this measure as any man can be, but I confess I am less enthusiastic over it than are some of the farmers in the big cities. It is not as important to teach the farmer how to produce crops as it is to find him a market for his products or to reduce the cost of production so that his industry will yield him a profit. The State which I have the honor, in part, to represent produced more than 150,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1912. That, sir, is an indication, so far as production is concerned, that the farmer in my State needs no special teaching in that line. I am not objecting, however, to any measure that will aid people in other sections of the country where they have not learned to farm as we have learned it in North Dakota.

Mr. President, to show to the Senate that the statement I have just made should receive some consideration, I wish to quote from the agricultural expert who has just made his first report of what is known as the Better Farming Association of North Dakota. Mr. Thomas P. Cooper, who, I understand, has been employed by the Federal Government, has this to say on that particular point:

The problems of the agricultural sections of the State are to a great extent economic and social rather than the immediate question of production. Under the systems of farming which have been developed the North Dakota farmer has become expert in the production of the small grains cheaply. Farmers generally are well acquainted with the methods of agriculture which will enable them to produce crops. They are not familiar, however, with the methods of farm management required under other systems of farming or where new crops and live stock are to be used. Much additional knowledge is necessary.

The fundamental problem, then, consists in arousing action among farmers and the public to such an extent that new systems of farming, new crops, and live stock will be generally adopted. This necessitates the creation of a new sentiment toward our farm lands and toward the farm as a permanent source of wealth and of income. Briefly, the basic agricultural problems confronting the work of this association may be classified as, first, the maintenance of the fertility of the soil, involving new cropping systems and the use of live stock; second, the introduction and general use of new economic crops, such as clovers, alfalfa, winter grains, and cord; third—

And, Mr. President, I think this should have been first—

Third, the business reorganization of the farm for greater profits.

If you want to help the farmer in his condition, make it possible for him to receive a greater remuneration from what he produces. Will any Senator tell me that if farming were as profitable as other industries we would experience any difficulty in getting more people on the farms? In that respect farming has not been a profitable business.

I wish to quote briefly from a special message of Theodore Roosevelt, sent to the Senate February 9, 1909, upon this subject:

Yet farming does not yield either the profit or the satisfaction that it ought to yield and may be made to yield.

The special commission appointed to make a report on the condition of country life has this to say:

(A) STATEMENT OF THE GENERAL FARM PROBLEM.

The farm labor problem, however, is complicated by several special conditions, such as the fact that the need for labor is not continuous, the lack of conveniences of living for the laborer, long hours, the want of companionship, and in some places the apparently low wages. Because of these conditions the necessary drift of workmen is from the open country to the town. On the part of the employer the problem is complicated by the difficulty of securing labor, even at the relatively high prices now prevailing, that is competent to handle modern farm machinery and to care for live stock and to handle the special work of the improved dairy. It is further complicated in all parts of the country by the competition of railroads, mines, and factories, which, by reason of shorter hours, apparently higher pay, and the opportunities for social diversion and often of dissipation, attract the native farm hand to the towns and cities.

The difficulty of securing good labor is so great in many parts of the country that farmers are driven to dispose of their farms, leaving their land to be worked on shares by more or less irresponsible tenants, or selling them outright, often to foreigners. All absentee and proxy farming (which seems to be increasing) creates serious social problems in the regions thus affected. There is not sufficient good labor available in the country to enable us to farm our lands under present systems of agriculture and to develop our institutions effectively. Our native labor supply could be much increased by such hygienic measures as would lessen the unnecessary death rate among country children and insure better health to workmen.

So long as the labor supply is not equal to the demand the country can not compete with the town in securing labor. The country must meet the essential conditions offered by the town or change the kind of farming.

The most marked reaction to the labor difficulty is the change in modes of farm management, whereby farming is slowly adapting itself to the situation. In some cases this change is in the nature of more intensive and businesslike methods whereby the farmer becomes able

to secure a better class of labor and to employ it more continuously. More frequently, however, the change is in the nature of a simplification of the business and a less full and active farm life. In the sod regions of the Northeast the tendency is toward a simple or even a primitive nature farming, with the maximum of grazing and meadow and the minimum of hand labor. In many States the more difficult lands are being given up and machinery farming is extending. This results in an unequal development of the country as a whole, with a marked shift in the social equilibrium. The only real solution of the present labor problem must lie in improved methods of farming. These improvements will be forced by the inevitable depletion of soil fertility under any and all one-crop systems in every part of the country, and realized by the adoption on the part of intelligent, progressive farmers of a rotation of crops and a system of husbandry that will enable them to employ their labor by the year and thereby secure a higher type of workman by providing him a home with all its appurtenances. The development of local industries will also contribute to the solution of the problem.

The excessive hours of labor on farms must be shortened.

Anyone who has had experience in farming will know that farming has not been a profitable business.

But you tell me, sir, that we are going to help the farmer now and show him how he can increase production. Of course, we all welcome the assistance to an education which will help us to grow two blades where one grew before. We are all in favor of teaching the farmer to be able to produce more on the same number of acres than he has produced before. But I want to say that with the intensified farming greater production means an increased cost in farming. It is not because the farmer does not know how to produce larger crops and increase the yield on the farm, but it is because the profit he receives from his farm does not enable him to employ the labor that is necessary to produce that larger yield. It is for that reason and for that reason alone that we are unable to produce as much per acre in the United States as they are producing in foreign countries. We pay higher prices for labor than they do in Europe. We are confronted with the same conditions in the business of farming that other industries of this country have to experience, in that of paying higher wages. During the busy season of the year we have paid for the commonest kind of labor \$3.50 to \$4 per day.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. GRONNA. With pleasure.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am very much interested in the Senator's suggestion that the farmer is confronted with the same wage problem that the industries are in the industrial centers. Does not the Senator think that it is a much greater problem for the farmer? Does he not have to pay much higher wages in proportion than are paid in the industries, because of the inclination of European immigrants to go to cities and not to go to the country?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I think that is true, although I do not want anyone to take my judgment on that. I only know what we have to pay on the farm. I do not know what has to be paid by other industries.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask a question of the Senator?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GRONNA. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. ROOT. I do not know whether it is a fact in the Senator's part of the country, but it is in mine, that the one trouble about the wage question with the farmer is that there is a very short period during the year, under our method of conducting a farm, during which a large amount of help is needed. It is very difficult to get help where you can employ a man only a couple of months; it is only the chance, floating fellow that you can pick up. Where you can give a man but two months' employment or three months' employment during the year, and nothing for nine months, of course you have a much smaller supply and poorer material, and you have to pay higher wages.

It has seemed to me in studying the farm problems in central and northern New York, under conditions which prevail over a considerable part of the country certainly, that one very important thing is that there shall be suggested and taught to farmers, particularly to the small farmers, a method of utilizing their farms so that the need for employment will come along at one time after another and run during the greater part of the year. It certainly is under some conditions possible to bring about an equalization of requirement for labor instead of having a very high requirement at one time during the year and not during the remainder. Does not the Senator think something useful might be done in that direction?

Mr. GRONNA. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from New York for making the observation. It is absolutely true, as he has stated, and the condition in my State is exactly as he has stated. But, Mr. President, the provision of this bill is that 75 per cent of the money which we are now appropriat-

ing shall be used absolutely for field tests. If the provisions of the Lever bill were such that we could use this appropriation in educating the farmers to change the present methods of farming and thereby change present conditions, to give instructions how to grow new crops, how to change the farm from a grain farm to a dairy farm, then, Mr. President, I should have nothing to say in opposition to taking 75 per cent of this entire appropriation for that work.

We grow certain crops and have become, so to speak, specialists in producing them. We want to get away from that idea of growing but one kind of a crop, and the bill proposed by the Senator from Vermont will in a large measure help the agricultural interests in that way. We want more prosperity and fewer hobos. We are sick and tired of feeding and employing the large population of hobos that come from the cities that we necessarily have been employing during the summer months. They are not fit to perform the labor that is to be performed on the farm; they know no more about the business of farming than the farmer as a class knows about the profession of the law; they are incapable of performing their work in a satisfactory manner to the farmer or to those who employ them. But, sir, teach them vocations and trades and then let them come to our part of the country, and although we may have to pay them just as high wages as we are paying them now, they will be able to perform their work in a better way. You will have increased the efficiency of those men, for they have been taught how to perform labor.

The condition in the country in the rural districts is such that it is absolutely impossible to get competent labor on the farm. Why, sir, it is necessary for those who own their farms to work from 12 to 18 hours per day; and the necessary labor can not be had. It goes to show two things—first, that the business of farming is not profitable, and, secondly, that labor can not be had. You tell me the farmer has been very successful. Yes; he has been successful, because his land has increased in value. But take the farmer as a class, take his business as a producer, allow him reasonable wages for his work, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that within the last two decades farming has not been a profitable business.

I believe, sir, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont should have serious consideration. It may be that certain changes should be made in the measure, but I do not want to see it voted down simply on sentiment.

Neither do I want to let the so-called House bill pass without calling attention to the fact. I want the Record to show, if you please, that this legislation is not asked for by the farmer. I am not here to oppose it because the farmer does not ask for it. I am not here simply for the purpose of representing the farmer. I am here to help to the best of my ability each and every industry of the United States, but I do not want it to be understood that in the appropriation of this large amount of money you are simply appropriating it for the farmer, because you are not, and you know that you are not. I do not want the name of the farmer conjured with right here to help along other industries. I am willing to help other industries, as I have said, but let us do it upon their merits, or let us oppose them upon their demerits.

Mr. President, I have received a newspaper printed in my State, and I found in that paper the synopsis of a speech delivered by the president of our agricultural college, a most splendid man, a learned man, a man of great ability and with splendid education and experience in farming. He has this to say:

Good farming is the best insurance against crop failure. Farming is a business. It requires a better business head, a man of broader vision, to farm scientifically than to practice in any other profession.

That is a statement said to have been made by President Worst, of the Agricultural College of North Dakota.

Mr. President, if this is true, why should we look upon this matter in such a narrow way? Why should we look upon this industry as one that is being carried on by a lot of uneducated, ignorant men, who do not know any more than just how to hold the plow? I believe, sir, that if we pass the so-called Lever bill we should change the section of the bill which provides that three-fourths of this appropriation shall be used for field tests. I do not remember if the appropriation is contained in the first section. I will ask the Senator from Georgia in what section is embodied the provision that 75 per cent of the appropriation shall be used for field tests?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that is the third section. That was a provision put on in the other House, the Senator will remember. That was not in the original bill as I introduced it in the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, that is the very reason why I am making these few observations, in the hope that those Sena-

tors who are present to hear me will be willing to help me in changing that provision.

For years, Mr. President, we have been trying to change our methods of farming, and right here is a provision taking 75 per cent of the entire appropriation to be used for something that the farmer is trying to get away from.

It is not true that there is a shortage of farm products in this country; it is not true that the high cost of living is due to the high prices of agricultural products. In my town we have as good a market as can be found anywhere in the western country, and yet last fall we were compelled to sell our wheat as low as 67 cents per bushel; we had to sell our oats at 20 cents per bushel; we received from 30 to 32 cents per bushel for barley, and I presume that those who drink beer pay the same price as heretofore to those patriotic brewers who were here about a year ago and who were making such clamor all over the country against the high cost of living. I suppose that they are receiving the same amount for their beer now that they did when they paid \$1.54 per bushel for barley. The other day, going through the city of Minneapolis, I stepped into a grocery store and asked the grocer, whom I have known for more than 30 years, a man who is still in that business, what reduction, if any, had been made in the price of cereals. To my astonishment I found that, with oats at 20 cents per bushel, Quaker Oats in packages were selling at the same price that they were when we received 52 cents per bushel—not a reduction of a single cent. I found, to my surprise, that Corn Flakes, Pettijohn's Breakfast Food—in fact, all the cereals—are selling at the same price now that they were a year ago, when the price of grain was double what it is to-day; and yet the people in the cities believe, and honestly so, that the high prices paid for the farm products is the cause of the high cost of living.

If you want to help the farmer, if you want to help the people of the country, do something for them that will aid distribution. If those of you who live in the cities and are complaining because of the high cost of living will help us to devise some method whereby we can distribute all this immense amount of products that are now going to waste, you will be benefited; you will get your products at a lower cost, and the farmer will get a fair and reasonable price for the products of his labor.

Mr. President, the matter of greatest importance to the farmer and to the country is not in showing the farmer how to farm, but the great question before the country, so far as agriculture is concerned and so far as the comfort and enjoyment of the people who depend upon the farming industry are concerned, is how to develop methods whereby the farmer can receive a fair price for his products, and to facilitate distribution in such a way that the public may receive the products of the farm at reasonable prices.

Millions of bushels of vegetables go to decay in certain sections of our country, while in other sections the public is hungry for them. In my State, North Dakota, thousands and thousands of acres of potatoes were not dug, but were left in the ground for fertilizer. Because they were selling at prices that would not pay for the labor, there would have been an absolute loss in taking them out of the ground, and so they were left there to decay. At the same time I found right here in the city of Washington that potatoes were selling for \$1.10 a bushel, although in North Dakota we could not receive 15 to 25 cents a bushel; yet the farmer is being charged with direct responsibility for the high cost of living.

Ah, Mr. President, this is a serious proposition. I want, so far as I am able, to convince the Senate that it is not true that there is a scarcity of farm products in the United States. It is not true, sir, that the farmer is the cause, directly or indirectly, of the high cost of living.

Mr. President, it was with reluctance and a good deal of hesitancy that I began to make these observations upon this bill. In the first place, I know the meaning of the bill; I know, sir, that there is a powerful element back of it. Every banker in the cities, in the towns, and in the villages is demanding or asking for the passage of the bill. I am not going to say that they misunderstand it, but I am going to say that if they understood the provisions of this bill as I understand them they would not be so enthusiastic as they are in favor of its passage.

I am not willing to let it go unchallenged; I am not willing to have it said that we are passing a measure just for the benefit of the farmer. It would not be fair to the country to pass any measure that would benefit one industry at the expense of another; but I believe, sir, that if you want to do something for the country you must commence to educate the boy and the girl. It is too late to educate the old farmer. His mind is settled, his ideas are fixed, and you will not meet with very great success in going upon his farm and making field tests to show him how he will be better able to produce more grain per acre.

If you want to help the people of the United States you will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], because that is a measure wide enough in its scope to benefit not only one industry, but every industry in the United States. Oh, you may tell me that there is no necessity for vocational education or for instruction in the trades and home economics. Are you going to deny the farmer's daughter the opportunity of getting an education in home economics? Are you going to deny to the children of the men of the cities the right to receive some instruction in the trades and in the vocations which are absolutely necessary to carry on the great industries of this country? I care not where these men may be located or where they may live, when you have taken their boys or their girls and given them an education in the vocations, in the trades, or in home economics, you have increased their efficiency, you have done something for the people of our country.

The Senator from Georgia is perhaps as well qualified to talk upon this subject as any man in the Senate. I have not tried, Mr. President, to express any theory of my own or to advance any new philosophy. I have simply called attention to a few facts which are practical in everyday life. I desire to repeat, in order to emphasize the fact, that there is as much need for vocational education and knowledge of the trades on the farm as anywhere else on earth, because the farmer, to be successful, must at least have some one in his family or some one on his farm who has knowledge and ability as a blacksmith, as a carpenter, and as a harness maker.

The farmer's wife certainly is expected to understand her duties as a housewife, and she has the absolute right to instruction in home economics as much as anyone else.

I did not expect to take up so much of the time of the Senate. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] reminds me, however, of something I have overlooked—that it is as difficult, and more so, to get servants to help do the housework as it is to get laborers to do the work on the farm. Farmers who are getting along in years and who find it difficult—and they all find it difficult—to have the work done on the farm, are anxious to sell their farms, not because they do not love farm work—because it is a delightful work if you are not worked too hard—but because it is impossible, under existing conditions, to take any recreation and enjoy the pleasure that every man and woman is entitled to whether in the city or in the country. It is impossible to get service either in the house or upon the farm.

For these reasons, Mr. President, if we are to pass a bill at all, I ask Senators to consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont upon its merits, and if they do, I believe they will incorporate it in the House bill or accept it in place of the House bill.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, agricultural education and education in the trades should go hand in hand. They are of equal importance. Our way of living in this day leads us to interchange the labor of the city and the labor of the country, both in the matter of seasons and in the effort to better conditions. Sometimes it drifts toward the country and sometimes toward the city. Our smaller places throughout the country are getting to be manufacturing places as well as the cities. So we have industrial pursuits and agricultural pursuits all mixed up, and there is no reason why they should not be treated upon a par.

I am therefore in favor of providing for education in the trades as well as for education in agriculture, both at the same time and in the same way.

There is another thing that is sometimes overlooked. That is that farming is no longer a matter of everyday drudgery. Farming to-day is done by machinery; and there is nothing so much needed on the farm to-day to make it profitable and to make farm life tolerable as that the farm people shall be educated in the trades.

Take the matter of engineering, for instance. It might be thought that that would never be practiced except in the cities. But to-day the traction engine is going all over the country, it is taking the place of the horse, and engineers are wanted everywhere.

Take the milling of the country. Not very far back it was confined to the cities and to places that had water power and to places where it was convenient to build steam mills. Nowadays the power is furnished by gasoline engines, which are being sold literally by the million to go to all parts of the country. It is necessary to have men who are skilled in the trades not only to operate those engines, but to operate all of the subsidiary machinery that goes with them.

So I think what we should do, Mr. President, is to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, and to pass it and the so-called Lever bill at the same time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	McLean	Sanders
Bankhead	Gamble	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Bradley	Gardner	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Brandeggee	Gronna	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Bristow	Guggenheim	Oliver	Smoot
Brown	Hitchcock	Overman	Stephenson
Bryan	Jackson	Owen	Swanson
Burnham	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thomas
Catron	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Percy	Wetmore
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Perkins	Williams
Crawford	Kern	Perky	Works
Cullom	Lippitt	Pomerene	
Dillingham	Lodge	Richardson	
Fletcher	McCumber	Root	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the call of the roll 57 Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to strike out section 10 of the proposed amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will not prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The roll will be called on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). In the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] from the city I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and vote "nay."

Mr. GARDNER (when his name was called). Notwithstanding my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE] I am at liberty to vote on this proposition. I vote "nay."

Mr. LIPPITT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. Not knowing how he would vote upon this question I withhold my vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I wish to announce my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and therefore I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], and let my vote stand.

Mr. CUMMINS. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is absent from the Senate on public business.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE], who is absent on business of the Senate, and I withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (after Mr. GALLINGER had voted in the negative). The present occupant of the chair is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. As that Senator has not voted, the vote is withdrawn.

The result was announced, yeas 12, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—12.			
Ashurst	Burton	Perky	Smith, Ariz.
Bryan	Helskell	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.
Burnham	McCumber	Root	Thomas
NAYS—44.			
Bradley	Dixon	Kern	Perkins
Brandeggee	Fletcher	Lodge	Sanders
Bristow	Gamble	McLean	Simmons
Brown	Gardner	Martine, Va.	Smoot
Catron	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Nelson	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Newlands	Swanson
Crawford	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Thornton
Cullom	Johnston, Ala.	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Jones	Paynter	Wetmore
Dillingham	Kenyon	Percy	Works

NOT VOTING—39.

Bacon	Curtis	Lippitt	Shively
Bankhead	du Pont	Massey	Smith, Md.
Borah	Fall	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Foster	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Briggs	Gallinger	Oliver	Stone
Chamberlain	Gore	Owen	Tillman
Chilton	Jackson	Penrose	Warren
Clapp	Johnston, Tex.	Poin Dexter	Watson
Crane	La Follette	Reed	Williams
Cuberson	Lea	Richardson	

So the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Georgia to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On page 16, of section 21, I move to strike out, beginning at the middle of line 15, the balance of section 21.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, line 15, after the numerals and the semicolon, strike out the remainder of the section in the following words:

But the total number of such agricultural high schools in any State shall not be less than 1 for each 15 counties nor more than 1 for each 5 counties or fraction of 5 counties. Any such agricultural high school shall be open to admission without tuition charges and upon the same conditions to all persons otherwise qualified as herein provided residing in the district in which such school is located; but such school may be supported and controlled by the State, or by the district in which it is located, or by a portion thereof.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I hope the amendment may not prevail.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to state why I think it is important that this amendment should prevail. The provision that I move to strike out undertakes to limit the size of the territory in which these high schools shall exist. It says that in no case shall there be less than 5 counties and in no case shall there be more than 15 counties. I think the authorities of the State ought to be allowed to determine the size of the territory covered by an agricultural high school.

The only effect of the amendment to strike out is to leave the size of the territory in which the agricultural high schools are to exist to the authorities of the State. I can not see any advantage in undertaking to determine it ourselves by counties. Some counties are very large and other counties are very small. Some States have very small counties and other States have very large counties. To say that no high school, no matter how small the counties, shall have over 15 counties, and that no high school, no matter how large the counties, should have less than 5 counties, it seems to me is an unnecessary interference with the plan of location of the high schools.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Georgia please suspend for a moment? The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WORKS. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The object of my motion is to free the bill from that objection. It does not in any sense lessen the appropriation for the agricultural high schools. It lets the agricultural high schools stand exactly upon the plan the bill provides, but it removes the limitations as to territory.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the amendment as read by the Secretary to include also the last sentence of the section. Possibly that was a mistake.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was a mistake. It is to strike out all down to the word "but."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have the amendment stated again from the desk, so that we may know exactly what is proposed to be stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, line 16, after the numerals and the semicolon, strike out down to and including the word "located" and the semicolon on line 23 in the following words:

But the total number of such agricultural high schools in any State shall not be less than one for each 15 counties nor more than one for each 5 counties or fraction of 5 counties. Any such agricultural high schools shall be open to admission without tuition charges and upon the same conditions to all persons otherwise qualified as herein provided residing in the district in which such school is located.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate for one minute on this matter. I will simply say that this bill has been submitted to the different States, and 35 of the different States have said that they approve this feature of the bill, or they have really approved the bill and have not objected to this feature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. I now wish to withdraw that amendment with the consent of the Senate. May I be permitted to do so?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment having been amended, it would not be in order.

Mr. PAGE. I give notice that when the bill comes into the Senate I shall move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Page bill in its entirety.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont as a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If no further amendments be proposed as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PAGE. I now move in the Senate, instead of the amendments as reported by the Committee of the Whole, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Page bill in its entirety.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think that is a great mistake on the part of the Senator from Vermont. I hardly think it is treating justly those who have helped make this measure. He came in himself with the House bill; we perfected the House bill, and we put in the essence of his bill which was not contained in the House bill as an amendment to the House bill. Now, he goes back to his bill No. 3, abandons the amendments that we have just adopted, abandons the bill that we have adopted as in Committee of the Whole, and asks us to strike out the measure that we have perfected as in Committee of the Whole.

I only desire to let the Senate understand what his motion is, and upon agreeing to it I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Vermont will not press that amendment. I feel it is hardly just to those who have supported his proposed measure who are friends of the Lever bill and who assumed from statements he made that he was willing to accept the Lever bill as a part of his own measure. I certainly have acted upon the theory that the Senator from Vermont was willing to incorporate his bill and the Lever bill in one measure, and now to make a change at this time it seems to me is not wise and it is hardly just.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I wish to say that on the 17th day of January I made a motion to amend. After I had made that motion the Senator from Georgia came to me and asked me if we could not reach some compromise. It almost took my breath away when he came, and I said—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to correct the Senator. I did not ask the Senator to make a compromise.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I will retract what I said. I will say that I stood upon the other side of the Chamber and the Senator came to me, and that is what I understood him to say. I said, "Senator, I am very happy indeed to do this, because my friends on this side have urged me to make some compromise with Senator SMITH. I will meet you at your house and we will see if we can not agree upon some compromise." I did so, and when I came back into the Senate imagine my surprise when I found that that compromise had not been understood by the Senator from Georgia. We have found ourselves with a variety of changes of views here in regard to the amendment which I offered on the 24th day of January, as I supposed to meet the wishes and views of the Senator from Georgia. I find that I was mistaken.

Now, I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], because he has been a friend of this measure from the first, that Senate bill No. 3 and the Lever bill are almost identical, the difference being that the Lever bill appropriates \$3,480,000 and Senate bill No. 3, \$3,000,000. I would be quite willing that in conference any amendment should be made that was thought best, but for the time being I find that I have

embarrassed my friends here by offering the amendment, which I certainly did in good faith to meet, as I supposed, the views of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. I understood Friday afternoon that he contemplated offering the Page bill, commencing at section 10, as an amendment to the Lever bill. I understood that that was to be the method of procedure. If I mistake not he gave me marked out what he purposed to offer as an amendment, commencing at section 10. It was to be offered as an amendment to the Lever bill, and it would go on that bill as an amendment. I am frank to say that it was my purpose to vote that that amendment should go on the Lever bill. But to come in now and offer it as a substitute, when the House of Representatives has passed the Lever bill, and we have perfected it, to throw out our entire work and offer a substitute, it seems to me is not acting in good faith with those who were working for the Page bill, and it is not wise to do it.

I understand that the Lever bill is a part of the Page bill, and after section 10, as amended, it includes all that the Senator desires.

It appears to me that the right course to pursue for those of us who have been cooperating is to continue the method of cooperation we have been following. Why should the House of Representatives be slapped in the face? They sent this bill here for our consideration. The purpose is to get legislation and not the mere prestige of having a bill with a different name attached to it. It seems to me the right course for us to pursue is to stand by the amendment as we understood it was to be offered and as it has been adopted.

Then the bill can properly be considered as the product of both the House and the Senate. If you want to accomplish this legislation—if we are anxious to bring the benefits to the country—the right way to do it promptly and efficiently is to amend the Lever bill and let the Lever bill stand with the portions of the Page bill desired as an amendment to that bill.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I simply repeat myself when I say that I consented to the amendment offered by me on the 24th day of January with a good deal of reluctance as to many of its features, but being urged, as I was by the friends of the measure on this side, to reach some compromise with the Senator from Georgia, if possible, I consented to amendments to which I did not fully subscribe. As far as I understand the matter, the arrangement, if one was made—I will withdraw that because the Senator from Georgia says there was no arrangement—the proposal which I made or which we made, it makes no difference, was disagreed to because the Senator from Georgia came in here and notified the Senate that he was opposed to the amendment which I offered on January 24 as a substitute measure. Having made that offer in good faith as a compromise and having had that compromise repudiated, I now wish to say to the Senate that I have spent two years in perfecting this bill and I believe it is right, and inasmuch as that compromise was repudiated, I hope the Senate will pass the Page bill in its entirety without the change of a comma, and when we get into conference I will be as square as anyone in trying to reach legislation. I believe that—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me to finish the sentence, I believe that the Lever bill and the Page bill are identical except in some very few minor particulars.

If it was not so, I would say that it was absolutely improper for me to take the course I am pursuing. But inasmuch as it is simply a matter of words and a matter of construction, the material points of the Lever bill and the Page bill being the same, I hope the Senate will now pass the Page bill in its entirety without the change of a single comma.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not insist on his motion. I believe the Senators on this side will feel that they have been misled, and misled by the Senator from Vermont. I am sure that is the way I feel about it.

I listened very closely to the Senator's speech at the time he offered his bill as a substitute for the Lever bill. On two separate occasions during his argument the Senator stated that he had incorporated in his bill the Lever bill, without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i."

I am in favor of the Lever bill and I am in favor of the principle of the balance of the bill of the Senator from Vermont, although I think it is rather crudely drawn, and it ought to be redrafted. I want to be sure that we will get some legislation, and I think it would be unwise for us to materially amend the Lever bill in whatever bill we may pass here. I

trust the Senator from Vermont will not insist upon his motion.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from North Carolina is acting under a misapprehension when he supposes that in my proposed amendment I am materially changing the Lever bill. There are some few minor differences, and only a few.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the changes are immaterial, why should the Senator ask us now to take a different measure from that which he offered as a substitute in the beginning, with the positive and repeated assurance that he did not change the Lever bill in any particular, either as to letter or as to punctuation?

Mr. PAGE. I can only say I believe the amendment of January 24 was somewhat crude, because it was drawn in a good deal of haste. I wish to say that so far as the original bill is concerned it has been drawn with the greatest care and every detail looked after. I believe the Page bill, Senate bill No. 3, as originally before the Senate January 17, is a perfected measure. I am far from certain that the new bill is; and I simply say that, inasmuch as they reach the same conclusion substantially, I would rather have the original bill passed than to take the chances of an imperfect bill, which I think may have been drawn in consequence of the proposed arrangement with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. I understand the Senator from Vermont offered an amendment which he had printed some days ago?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. No; the amendment has not been agreed to. Do I understand the Senator has withdrawn that amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; the amendment has been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole and reported to the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, his amendment was agreed to, and as I understand the parliamentary situation, after we come into the Senate he changes his program in the Senate from what he followed as in Committee of the Whole. If we vote against his bill as a substitute it still gives us an opportunity to vote for that amendment as adopted in the Senate. So if we vote down the bill he offers as a substitute—the Lever bill, with the amendment made—and following, section 10 will still be before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, it would be most unfortunate if any misunderstanding exists between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Vermont which would result in a confusion in the consideration of this bill as to some of us who have not kept up with it as closely as our duty requires, largely upon the faith we had in those two Senators. I believed that the progress which was made in maturing the bill has been in the direction of an adjustment that would be satisfactory; and if it were not, it left the bill in such a condition that it might be perfected in the conference committee. Unless the matter is in dispute between the two Houses it would not be subject to the jurisdiction of that committee.

As I understand what has transpired here within the last few days, there has been an effort made to pick out from the two bills the merits of both and unite them in a common bill, and that that end has been substantially attained in the report that was made by the Committee of the Whole to the Senate.

I would not like to differ with my worthy friend from Vermont on a question of recollection about a matter that would be material if a dispute should arise over it; but many of us, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], have been very agreeable witnesses to the fact that this harmonious condition existed between himself and the Senator from Georgia.

Now, if we vote to strike down the Lever bill with all the wholesome amendments that have been added to it by the action of the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and to take up the original Page bill, it would require us to familiarize ourselves a little more with that particular bill than would otherwise be the case. A situation therefore has been created that would take some of us by surprise, or at least find us in a state of unpreparedness, which would not otherwise exist had the two bills been projected from the beginning.

I am willing to yield my judgment to the Senator from Vermont on this particular measure, but in view of what has transpired I feel somewhat committed to vote against his proposition to submit his bill as an entirety in its original form. I feel like I should vote to ratify by the action of the Senate the amendments that have been reported from the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I regret the Senator from Vermont should suggest that any agreement between himself and myself in any way was not carried out. I hesitate about referring to matters that took place in private. I will only do so to this extent: I will state that the Senator from Vermont had for a number of weeks been urging me to have a private conference with him with reference to his bill, and finally he even suggested that he would call at my house, which I, of course, invited him to do. I was glad to see him there, and for several hours the subject was discussed, and I expressed certain criticisms with reference to the bill and suggested certain modifications of it. The Senator from Vermont made some modifications in the bill, and I explained to him that I did not mean even then that I could support the entire measure as he had redrafted it, although with two small exceptions this morning I reached the conclusion that I would vote for the majority of the provisions that he put into his amendment.

I want to state just what my attitude with reference to the matter is. I am deeply interested in seeing some legislation passed at this session. I begin with what we term the Lever bill. I am exceedingly anxious to see that bill passed, as the House has already passed it. If we can not get anything more than it, I prefer it to nothing.

I would be glad to see also added a provision starting the work of vocational education; I would be glad to see a provision starting the contribution to the agricultural high schools; and I would be glad to see a provision contributing something to the normal schools for instruction in industrial work.

That I did not agree to the entire measure as the Senator from Vermont presented it is true, and I do not now approve it as a whole. I do not believe we can possibly get it as a whole, and I do not think the Senate expects it. I think the Senate to-day in voting for it looks to see it improved and perfected in conference.

Now, what have we done to-day? What has been the result of the work we have been engaged on for a number of days? We have been trying to prepare a bill we hoped we might pass. We begin by taking the bill which the House has already passed. That is their idea of agricultural-extension work. We made a few small amendments to it, and we prepared to go back to the House, saying "We agree with you on your measure; we are taking no substantial issue with you on the measure you have approved; but we have added some amendments, and we invite you to come and join us in adding these amendments to the measure which you matured and passed."

That is what we did as in Committee of the Whole. We adopted those amendments, and those amendments which we adopted, going beyond what I thought it was advisable to adopt, cover practically the whole of the vocational work that was contemplated in the original Senate bill No. 3. We have added that vocational work to the House extension bill. We voted on it, and after we have acted upon it; after we have discussed it for days; after we have made a few amendments to it—not very material; after the two pieces of work have been put together, starting with the House bill and following on with the vocational bill of the Senator from Vermont, when we come into the Senate the Senator from Vermont asks us to repudiate the work of the Committee of the Whole and go back and take up a bill that we have not read, and which has not been considered at all in these days of work that we have been putting upon this measure. If we take that course, we shall take the best course we could pursue to kill the whole measure. As, I believe, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has said, we practically slap the House in the face.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Some of us were not present all of the time, and I think we would be gratified if the Senator from Georgia would explain to us wherein the amendment now offered by the Senator from Vermont differs from the bill as perfected in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would have to take it and read it all over and study it in order to do that. I do not know exactly.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Vermont says there is practically no difference.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, if that is true, why not adhere to what we have been working on for three or four days?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not giving my own opinion one way or the other. I am simply asking if the Senator can show us wherein there is a difference?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not. I would, as I have said, have to take the bill up and restudy it. I have had my attention given for the past three days to the details of the measure

before the Senate; I have had my attention given to the extension work of the House bill; and I have dismissed from my mind the other measure so far as it was contained in the original Page bill, No. 3.

Mr. McCUMBER. There seemed to be some objection, Mr. President, on the other side to the amendment because it was abandoning the House bill. Well, every amendment abandons it to some extent, and as amendments have been put in the bill in Committee of the Whole, I can not see the force of the claim of abandonment, because the bill will still remain the House bill, bearing the House number, acted upon in the Senate in either instance as a House bill, or the Lever bill, amended.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The proposition now of the Senator from Vermont is to strike everything out of the House bill but the title, to add a new title, and to substitute for it Senate bill No. 3, that we have not had under consideration as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McCUMBER. But it would still be the House bill, bearing the House number, and would hold its place and occupy a position as the House bill. That would not change it and make it a Senate bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It would have the number of the House bill, with nothing in it that the House put into it.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the broad statement has been made here, and has been made several times, that this is not only an abandonment of the House bill, but that it strikes out everything that is contained in that bill. On the contrary, I understood that this amendment includes the provisions of the House bill substantially as they passed the House. If that be so, it is simply an addition to the work that has been done by the House, and it is in no sense an abandonment of the House bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You will have to take it up and study it to find out whether it is or not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The statement made by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] leads me to ask the Senator from Georgia if he will not state to the Senate the essential differences between these two bills as they deal with extension departments, which have already been established under the law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am not prepared, without some lengthy attention to the matter, to do so. I have dismissed the provisions of Senate bill No. 3 from my mind for quite a length of time. I have been devoting my attention to helping perfect the bill as it was passed in the other House, and I have been studying that bill to the exclusion of the other. I would have to go back to it and study it again in order to do what the Senator from Wisconsin requests.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not mean, Mr. President, in all details, but just simply that the Senator from Georgia state to us the essential differences. I have no doubt, from the study which the Senator from Georgia has made of these two measures, of his ability to clearly place before the Senate those differences.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think I could mention two or three. The amount of the appropriation is different in the two bills. There is a provision in the House bill that nothing contained in that bill shall interfere with the demonstration work now being done by the Department of Agriculture, which we perfected here so as to provide that it should not interfere with certain work in the line of plant industries. In the House bill there is a provision as to the way in which the fund is to be used that is not contained in the Senate bill. The details of the plan of handling the money and the description of the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to the matter are somewhat different. I think it is worked out more in detail in the House bill than it is as contained in the original Page bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia whether it be true, or not, that the provision in the Page bill covering the subject of the Lever bill is found in section 7?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I therefore suggest, if the Senator from Georgia can not state the differences, that the Secretary read the Lever bill and then read section 7 of the Page bill. We can all tell, then, what are the differences.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I infer from the debate that it was the understanding of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] when

he introduced the amendment that was adopted as a substitute for the Lever bill that he had reached an agreement of some kind with the friends of the Lever bill in the Senate, but it appears that that was a misunderstanding, and that the friends of the Lever bill now seem to be opposed to the amendment; that they did oppose it and voted against it. I happened to be absent when the vote was taken, but there was a division. The consequence is that, unless we adopt the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Vermont and go back to his original bill, which was the bill considered by the committee, the bill upon which he has worked, as he says; which he has had mere or less before the Senate for the last year, at least, and on which he delivered his speech of June 5, 1912—unless we go back to that original bill and take that, we will be passing an amendment here with which nobody is satisfied.

The Senator from Vermont says that he made the concessions which were contained in that amendment in order to reach an agreement with the friends of the Lever bill, but it seems that he failed in that object. The Senator from Vermont prefers the original bill to the amendment. The Senator from Georgia is not satisfied with the amendment. So it would seem to be the reasonable thing to do, if the Senate, as is evident, is in favor of vocational education—of education in the trades and industries, and of providing for Federal aid to agricultural schools—to adopt the bill which has received the greatest care and consideration on the part of the committee and of the Senator from Vermont, which includes all of the provisions which have been suggested by him, and to allow those provisions to go to conference, so that they may be considered there.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask what feature is there in the original bill No. 3 which has not been put on by amendment? Can the Senator from Washington state?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The amendment is almost identical with the bill, except as to minor differences. The title is different; it drops the bill which has come to be known as the Page bill; it deprives, in a measure, the Senator from Vermont of the credit of the legislation by dropping his bill and taking up an amendment. I understand it is true that in its principal features the amendment which has been adopted is identical with the original bill, but the Senator from Vermont prefers the form of the original bill; he prefers the manner in which it is expressed. It has been considered by the committee. I confess that I have not had an opportunity to consider the details of the form of these several bills, and I am simply speaking about the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves—that we have adopted an amendment here which has not received the favor of either side to the controversy as between the Lever bill and the Page bill. The Page bill is conceded by everybody to contain substantially the Lever bill, also a number of additional features. We should adopt that bill and allow the matter to go to conference, so that the form of this legislation, the substance of which the Senate seems to have agreed to—there are very few here who are opposed to it, and it is a question of the form in which it is guarded, the manner in which these appropriations are to be expended—so that the form of the legislation can be finished and perfected in conference between the two Houses.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. ROOT. I rose to ask the Senator from Washington if he would point out, or perhaps the Senator from Vermont might point out, those portions of the original bill No. 3, which we speak of as the Page bill—the original, I mean, which he now moves to substitute—which reproduce the provisions of the Lever bill? I ask, Mr. President, because I am much interested in perfecting our system of conveying information about agriculture to the farmers of the country by means of these extension departments and field demonstrations. I think that it is just as important for this country now to increase the productivity of agriculture as it ever was to increase the productivity of manufacturing when the original protective tariff was adopted.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. Excuse me for one moment. I should not like to have any substitute adopted here which leaves out the practical and effective provisions of the bill which the Senator from Georgia has been urging. On the other hand, I am a very firm believer in the importance of vocational education. I am not convinced that the Government of the United States ought to go into that, and I am far from being convinced that the scheme which has been evolved here for imposing control by the Government of the United States upon the secondary schools of the country is a wise scheme. I have very grave

doubt about that; but I certainly do not want to vote upon this great mass of provisions without knowing the relation of one to the other. If the Senator will point out what parts of the Page bill, which he now moves to substitute, reproduce the provisions of the Lever bill, I shall be very much obliged to him.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROOT. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. I should like to ask the Senator from New York this question: No one denies that we are all interested in the productivity of agriculture and individually we desire a large yield; but I should like to have the Senator from New York point out to me where the farmer is particularly benefited by the production of large crops, in every section of our country, so that we have a large surplus. In other words, is it not true that we have no means whereby the farmer can regulate the price of his products at all, while, on the other hand, the manufacturer, whether he produces much or little, fixes the price of his product—something that the farmer can not do?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, answering the—

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I feel bound to answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota, if the Senator from Vermont will allow me.

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. ROOT. All the farmers whom I have ever known—and I have known a great many—would rather get 28 bushels of wheat to the acre than 14; they would feel better about it. The fact that the farmer individually can not regulate the prices of his products is no reason why his farm should not be made as productive as possible. The demand for food products in this country and throughout the world is increasing continually; the increased demand is continually increasing the prices which the farmer receives for his products; and as that demand continues to increase with the increase of population, the farmer stands to receive continually remunerative prices for his product, and, in my judgment, that increasing demand and the continuance of remunerative prices keep pace with the best improvement that is possible on the farms of this country.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator from New York misunderstood my question. I confess that I am as much in favor as is anyone else of increasing the productivity of our soil, and so, I believe, are the farmers of this country, but what I should like the Senator from New York, or any other Senator, to point out to me is the advantage that the farming industry or the farmer has received by the production of a large surplus. Is it not true that when this country has a large crop prices are reduced in proportion to the size of the crop? In 1910, for instance, there was a small crop all over the country, and in 1911 we had only a fair crop, but the farmers made money in 1911, while in 1912, with overproduction, there was practically a loss to the agricultural interests of the United States.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. Root] has asked me to point out the differences between the Lever bill and the Page bill, so far as what is known in the two bills as college extension work is concerned.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand the Senator from New York to inquire as to the difference between the substitute which the Senator from Vermont now offers and the bill which the Senate has agreed to as in Committee of the Whole. That is what I should like to know also.

Mr. PAGE. I was about to explain.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to know what difference there is between those two measures.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I asked rather for the similarity than the difference. I want to know where in the Page bill occur the provisions which are similar or which accomplish the same effect as the provisions which are in the Lever bill. I can not find them.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. PAGE. I should like to answer the Senator from New York for just a moment, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. OWEN. Just a moment. It seems to me that the point which needs explaining is the extent to which the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole do not include the Page bill.

Mr. PAGE. I will be very happy to answer that question. In the first place, Mr. President, the Page bill gives \$3,000,000 to college extension work, \$3,000,000 to district agricultural

schools, \$3,000,000 to education in the rural communities, and \$3,000,000 to education in the cities. There are four \$3,000,000 appropriations. The Lever bill leaves out appropriations for industrial schools and adds \$480,000 to college extension work. I consented to that. I do not know that I now object seriously to it, but still it seems to me that the \$480,000 added by the Lever bill is more than ought to go to that feature of the work in consideration of what we have given to the other features.

Next, the Page bill from first to last provides that whatever the Federal Government shall do shall be matched by the States. The Lever bill does not do that. As to the \$10,000 to each State which is immediately forthcoming and available under the Lever bill, it is provided that the States may have that fund absolutely without duplicating it. That is so contrary to the entire principle of the Page bill that I only yielded to the amendment because I wished to get a reasonable compromise. Third, the Lever bill contains this provision:

Sec. 3. That all correspondence for the furtherance of the purposes of this act issued from the agricultural colleges to their agents or by the agents of the said extension departments thereof receiving the benefits of this act shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge for postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster General from time to time may prescribe.

This provision was originally in Senate bill No. 3, but after very careful discussion it was thought to be an unsafe and unwise provision to incorporate. I do not know how many protests I received from publishers of agricultural papers in this country, who said to me: "If you incorporate this provision into your bill, you will perhaps allow the agricultural colleges to begin to publish newspapers; they can publish anything; and they can have, and will have, an unfair advantage over the agricultural press of this country, which ought to have a fair show in the fight, and they will not have it if you say that all the agricultural colleges may have the right to send everything they wish through the mails free." As every Senator knows, under the present statute they already have the right to send free the periodicals which they issue regularly. I do not know how extensive that privilege is; but, be that as it may, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, after considering it, thought it best to exclude that provision. That provision comes back to us from the House in the Lever bill.

I do not regard that as a very unwise feature; and as a compromise measure I was willing to accept it. I do not regard it as particularly unwise to add half a million dollars to the appropriation. As a matter of compromise, I was willing to accept that. I do not particularly object to giving the money to the States without making them duplicate it with an appropriation from their own treasuries; but I think it is wrong; I do not believe it is the best way. I believe the Page bill is the better way; and so, having failed of a compromise, I now come to say that, whereas I yielded reluctantly to these measures because of a supposed compromise, the compromise having been repudiated, I now ask that the Page bill in its original simplicity be enacted.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I do not know or care anything about the compromises which have been made or the conferences which have been held. The Senator from Vermont has not answered the question. I will put it more distinctly. Where in the bill which he moves to substitute are contained the provisions which reproduce the same effect as the provisions of section 2 of the Lever bill?

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator from New York has before him the original amendment proposed by me on the 17th of January, or if he has the original Page bill, he will find in it this provision:

That for the support—

Mr. BRISTOW and Mr. CRAWFORD. Where is that?

Mr. PAGE. On page 6 of the amendment offered by me on January 17, or in section 7 of the original Page bill, Senate bill No. 3. That provision reads in this way:

Sec. 7. That for the support in each State college of agriculture and the mechanic arts of an extension department or division, the sum of \$640,000 annually, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913—

Let me explain that—

Mr. CRAWFORD. For what purpose is that?

Mr. PAGE. I will read further:

of which annual appropriation \$10,000 shall be allotted to each of the 48 States for the benefit of such extension departments; and for the maintenance of such extension departments, the additional sum of \$400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

And so on, until it reaches \$3,000,000. I do not need to read further, because it simply provides for the extension from year to year until \$3,000,000 is reached.

Mr. ROOT. What is to be done with it?

Mr. PAGE. It is for what is known as college extension work. If Senators will turn to the bottom of page 2 in the

original Senate bill No. 3, they will find what this work means. It is there described as follows:

Third. "Agricultural-extension department or division" shall mean a department or division which is established under the provisions of this act and under the direction of a State college of agriculture and the mechanic arts in any State, and which gives instruction and demonstrations in agriculture and home economics to persons not residing at said college nor at the district agricultural schools provided for in this act and which conveys or imparts to such persons information on such subjects through field demonstrations, publications, and otherwise.

That is almost the exact provision of the Lever bill; there is a difference in language; but, so far as the purpose of the bill is concerned, it is almost identical. It relates to work carried from the experiment stations to the adult farmer on the farm. It covers that in both bills. If Senators will recall the discussions we have been having here in the Senate for the last year, they will remember that the provisions of the Smith bill, so called because the Senator from Georgia last spring introduced into the Senate a bill substantially like the Lever bill, that the provisions of the Smith bill or the Lever bill are almost identical with the provisions of the Page bill, so far as college extension work is concerned.

If the bills were not substantially identical I could easily see the impropriety of my motion. But inasmuch as they are identical, or nearly so, and inasmuch as I believe the bill which I have introduced has been drawn with greater care and is better safeguarded than the amendment which was introduced here, as I understood, to meet a compromise, I now ask, because I believe it is the better bill, that the original bill be substituted.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. PAGE. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I want to see if I am correct in my understanding. As I understand the Senator from Vermont, the practical difference is that the Lever bill provides for giving the franking privilege to the agricultural colleges and the schools that enjoy the benefit of these appropriations?

Mr. PAGE. An additional franking privilege.

Mr. BRISTOW. An additional franking privilege; and it also makes an appropriation from the Public Treasury which it does not require that the States shall meet with a like appropriation?

Mr. PAGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit an interruption there?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It seems to me section 31 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont cures that defect, because it specifically provides that a double amount of money must be provided by State or local taxation. That is the amendment which has been adopted in Committee of the Whole, and which the Senator now proposes to substitute for his original bill, which in Committee of the Whole he voluntarily withdrew, and upon the strength of which withdrawal many votes were secured for the bill.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to correct the Senator, because I know he desires to be absolutely correct. I said that under the amendment of January 24, which I offered, I had not changed so much as a comma. The provisions of the Lever bill do not provide that an equal amount shall be appropriated by the States; and as I understand—and I think the Senator from Georgia will agree with me—as the bill will be left if we pass it to-day as it came from the Committee of the Whole, there will not be required from the States an amount equal to the amount appropriated by the Federal Government.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me ask the Senator another question. Will not the bill which has been agreed upon in Committee of the Whole contain section 31, offered by the Senator himself?

Mr. PAGE. I do not know that I have offered any amendment to section 31.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator withdrew his original bill, Senate bill No. 3, and offered as an amendment to the pending bill everything following section 9. It is that which we have been discussing and that which we have finally agreed upon in Committee of the Whole. Section 31 of that amendment contains this provision:

But there shall in no case be disbursed under the terms of this act to any school or college out of moneys derived from the rural school department fund, the industrial school fund, the agricultural school fund, the college teachers' training fund, or the teachers' training fund, as provided by this act, more money than 50 per cent of the amount

which is supplied and expended during the same period for the same purpose for which such fund is to be expended out of either State and local or State or local public moneys.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the trouble with the Senator's conclusion there is that the feature pertaining to the college extension fund is not included in that list.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, as to three-quarters of the expenditures provided for in this bill, the provision is at least good?

Mr. PAGE. It is good as to practically all except the Lever appropriation of \$10,000 to the colleges. Under the Lever bill the appropriation of \$10,000 per year to the colleges is not to be duplicated by the States, while under the Page bill it is to be duplicated. In that respect I think the Page bill is the better.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator gave the impression that under the bill agreed upon in Committee of the Whole there was no obligation upon the States or the local communities to supply an equal amount of money. But this provision evidently covers the case as to three-quarters of the amount appropriated, and it is only in the case of one appropriation where that provision is not made.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say that that was my understanding—that there was an appropriation in the bill as it was agreed to in the Committee of the Whole that the States were not required to meet with an equal amount. I did not understand that the States did not have to meet part of the appropriation, but that there was one appropriation which they did not have to meet, and that that was one of the differences.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But that was a matter which the Senator himself could have cured in Committee of the Whole, and can still cure by an amendment.

I want to renew my statement made a few minutes ago—that it seems to me, without any regard to a disagreement between the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Georgia, that the Senator from Vermont should in good faith carry out what he publicly agreed to here on the floor of the Senate on the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa. The Senator from Vermont used this language:

I will state my purpose in moving the amendment to the Lever bill, so called, H. R. 22871: For many months I have been trying to get action upon the original Senate bill No. 3. That action, as the junior Senator from Georgia well understands, has been postponed and objected to from time to time until he believes—and I do not know but that I agree with him in that belief—that to pass now the original bill, Senate bill No. 3, and send it to the House would probably mean that it would go into the Committee on Agriculture of that body, and that it would there die the death which comes to so many bills which we send over to the House toward the close of a session. * * * If we are at this session of Congress to grant Federal aid to industrial education, it must be done by substituting Senate bill No. 3 for the House bill. In other words, Senators who are in favor of extending industrial education to the boy as provided by Senate bill No. 3 must vote for the amendment which I have offered, for it is probable that in no other way can we reach this legislation at this session. If the amendment which I have offered substituting the Page bill for the Lever bill is adopted, then the matter goes into conference, and out of that conference it is believed some bill carrying with it a measure of Federal aid to industrial education will result.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator right there for just a moment? That is my position at this time—that in order to get action at this session we must substitute the Page bill for the Lever bill, because then it will go into conference, and from that conference we can get out some kind of a bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will permit me to add a word, that was the Senator's original position. But about that time the Senator from Iowa took the floor, and suggested to the Senator from Vermont a method of simplifying the procedure by amalgamating the two bills. He did it in this way:

I think it would simplify matters very much if the Senator from Vermont would allow the bill presented by the Senator from Georgia to stand, inasmuch as he does not propose to change it, and simply offer as an amendment that part of his bill which deals with the vocational education and additional appropriations for agricultural education. I believe we would get along with it a little faster if that were done.

Then the Senator from Vermont said:

Mr. President, I am very anxious to adopt whatever is the best and most proper course here. My suggestion on the 24th instant was that I would offer the amendment which has been placed upon the desks of Senators this morning. But I recognize the fact that the Senator from Iowa is a warm friend of the whole measure, and I am rather inclined to accept his wishes and his views, if the Chair informs me that that is the proper parliamentary procedure.

Having given notice that I would introduce this amendment as a whole, I will ask, as a matter of parliamentary procedure, whether I may properly omit at this time from my proposed amendment the first nine sections, which really are identical with House bill No. 22871, and move to amend the House bill by adding to it all of that portion of the proposed amendment which follows section 9?

Thereupon the Chair naturally told the Senator from Vermont that it was his privilege to change his position, and he did

change it. We accepted the change, and we discussed the matter with the understanding that he had abandoned the original bill. No study has been placed upon the original bill since that time. We on this side have believed, and have voted with the Senator from Vermont in the belief, that he had abandoned the original bill, and had agreed to accept the suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa for the simplification of the matter.

It seems to me, after that has been done, that at least propriety, if not good faith, requires the Senator from Vermont to carry out the arrangement thus made in the open Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. PAGE. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am not much interested in the different processes and maneuvers that have been resorted to in order to get the bill up to the present stage, but I am interested in what the bill does.

If the amendment which the Senator from Vermont now offers changes the bill which we passed in the Committee of the Whole so as to limit the franking privilege instead of extending it, and so as to require the States to put up funds whenever the Federal Government does, I want to vote for those two propositions. I do not care what the different understandings or misunderstandings have been, but I am interested in the substance of the legislation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will permit me, it would be an easy matter to amend the bill in that way, and I would be very glad to join him in that. But it would not be necessary, in order to accomplish that, to take up a completely new bill which the Senate has not even been considering as in Committee of the Whole, and which does contain other features.

Mr. BRISTOW. If there is any other feature, I should like to know what it is. I have been trying to find out the differences between the two measures. Up to this time these two differences have been suggested. Are there any others?

Mr. PAGE. There are. I should like to have Senators give their attention to this statement, because I know that upon this point there is considerable difference of opinion.

The Lever bill gives \$10,000 a year to each State. That makes a total of \$480,000. Senate bill No. 3, as drawn, gives \$640,000. Touching that particular feature, I want to say that the head of one of the colleges in Mississippi came to me and said: "Senator PAGE, if you knew the struggle we are making in the South to get along and give the negroes of the South some education along industrial lines you would say that we should have \$10,000 for each agricultural college rather than \$10,000 for each State." In other words, in States that have two agricultural colleges they ask that we give an added \$10,000.

That feature was objected to by some, including, I think, the junior Senator from Georgia. But after a time I went to him with statements from Senators from the South, and said: "Senator, there is a strong feeling on the part of some that the negro colleges in the South should share this appropriation with the white colleges." The Senator from Georgia said to me substantially this—I do not want to misquote him, but as nearly as I can remember he said: "If you want to give us that added \$10,000, I do not think we will object to it." So the Page bill, as drawn, gives the same amount to the negro colleges of the South that it gives to the white colleges. In other words, it gives \$160,000 more, being \$10,000 for each State having a negro college.

The Senator from Kentucky came to me and pleaded for that provision. He said: "You do not know how much we in Kentucky need to give industrial education to the negroes. Will you not aid me to get that provision in?" I said: "So far as I am concerned, Senator, I do not want to do anything that will imperil my bill; but if the Senator from Georgia and those who objected agree I will agree." I supposed I had the consent of the Senator from Georgia, so far as he was concerned, that this \$10,000 for the agricultural colleges should be included in my bill, and so it was put in. But it is omitted from the Lever bill.

I do not want to say which is right. I wish the Senate might decide upon that. But I want to say that that provision is exactly as it was left by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. I do not feel at liberty to emasculate the bill by changing those features, unless it be to effect a compromise which will prevent any disastrous results to these two bills—the Lever bill and the Page bill.

If I supposed Senate bill No. 3 were going to be imperiled, every Senator here knows I would yield to any kind of a compromise. But the facts are that the Page bill and the Lever bill coincide; and when they get into conference we can, from those two measures, produce a bill that I believe will meet per-

fectly the views of the Senate and will be at least a start in the great plan of Federal aid to industrial education.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. PAGE. With pleasure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to ask the Senator if he has any less reason to-day for believing that the measure will be imperiled by insisting on original Senate bill No. 3 than he had a few days ago, when this same matter was up, and when he then thought it wise, in order to accomplish definite results, to accept the Lever bill, and to add to it the provisions of his bill? The situation to-day is not at all different from what it was then, it seems to me.

Let me say to the Senator that from the time he introduced the bill and I first gave it consideration I have been an advocate of Senate bill No. 3, known as the Page bill. I have been under the general impression that it included to a very large degree, and in a general way, the provisions of the House bill known as the Lever bill, and that it went still further. Believing, as I always have, that the great Department of Agriculture of our Government has for its chief function that of education, I have heartily favored the assistance provided in educational directions by both the Lever bill and Senate bill No. 3.

But there seems to be a difference of opinion as to whether or not the provisions covering that particular subject in Senate bill No. 3 are substantially the same as the provisions in what is known as the Lever bill that has passed the House. In order to avoid any difficulty on that score, particularly as long as the Senator has just reiterated what he has said over and over again—that his bill contains substantially the same provisions as the Lever bill—it seems to me that it is the safer proposition to accept the House bill and to add to it such provisions as we have agreed to as in Committee of the Whole, which provisions are the work and have been prepared under the direction and guidance of the Senator from Vermont.

There would then go to the conferees the measure as it passed the House, with certain additions; and it would be for them to determine which of those additions, if any, they would agree upon; and if they did not agree upon any of the additions, we would at least get a measure which has already passed the House, and which would then become a law. I appeal to the Senator—

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he has the slightest doubt that the bill, as I propose to amend it, would be the subject of a conference on the Lever bill, just as certainly as the Lever bill amended by the additional features of the Page bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. I confess, Mr. President, that in my judgment the measure would not then be in nearly so favorable a position, looking to definite results, as it would be if the Senator would accept the situation as it comes from the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to know why, Mr. President.

Mr. FLETCHER. Because there would go to the House an entirely new bill, not the Lever bill as it passed the House at all, not the Lever bill with amendments which are merely additions to the Lever bill. There would go to the House an entirely different measure, embodying different and varying propositions, which would be referred there to the conferees, and it would have to be all thrashed out over again. Delay would necessarily ensue; and in my judgment there would be very serious doubt about it ever coming to any result at this session of Congress if that should be done.

As a friend of the measure, originally known as Senate bill No. 3, as a friend of both these propositions, I most respectfully urge upon the Senator from Vermont to leave this matter as it came from the Committee of the Whole.

I am not quite clear in my own mind about it, although it has been assumed in debate here, but I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont on the 24th of January is now before the Senate as a part—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It has been adopted.

Mr. FLETCHER. It has been adopted; and although my recollection was that the Senator offered to withdraw that amendment in Committee of the Whole, I was not quite sure whether he did it or not. There was some confusion at the time.

Mr. PAGE. No; I did not.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator understand that his amendment offered on the 24th of January is the matter now before the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. PAGE. I should like to answer the Senator from Florida for just a moment. Then I shall be very glad to yield the floor to the Senator from Mississippi.

I made concessions, Mr. President, which I did not believe improved the bill. I believe the bill as it was originally drawn is a great deal the better bill. I have submitted my reasons for believing it is the better bill. When I consented to introduce the amendment of January 24, it was with the full expectation that I had reached a compromise, and that as a result of making the surrender and reaching a compromise we would have no opposition to the bill.

But the Senator will remember that all the afternoon objection after objection came up to the bill. So, finally, I feel, and I think the Senator will feel for me, that I have a right to say that now I should prefer to have the better and the stronger bill go to conference. If I thought it could not go into conference—if that is the parliamentary situation, and I am assured that it is by good parliamentarians—I should not object to anything. I want it to go to conference.

The language which I used, and which the Senator from Nebraska has quoted, conveys my exact sentiments. If I thought the bill could not go to conference, I would yield almost anything. But I am told that it can go to conference under the amendment I have offered, and believing that my last amendment is the better amendment, and that it more nearly perfects the bill, I should like to have it go in that way.

I believe that in the amendments that were hastily prepared to meet the views of the Senator from Georgia there were some things that were drawn too hastily. We have found now some very important defects in them. But the original bill, I believe, is perfect, so far as that is concerned. I believe every matter of technical language has been carefully provided for. It has been submitted to the best technicians I know in that line, and the bill has been approved by the educators of the country in the form in which I now ask it to go through. I hope Senators will not object to supporting my amendment, for I believe I have the better bill now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator continues to repeat that he introduced his amendment under a misapprehension, believing that a compromise had been reached. I desire to state that if he understood that agreement was by me he understood it in spite of the fact that I told him expressly that I would not agree to it. Nothing that I said justified him in believing that I intended to support it. I declined to agree to support it when the Senator came to my house. I told him as he left my house that I could not agree in advance to support it. I told him before he introduced it here that I had not agreed to support it.

I am a little weary of hearing upon the floor that the Senator introduced it under a misapprehension, if he means to refer to myself, as I have told him that I had not agreed to it often enough to exclude the justification of a misapprehension.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I did not mean to say that the Senator had told me one thing or the other. I simply say, and I repeat it, that I supposed the Senator and myself had reached an agreement. It seems that I am wrong about it, so I do not reiterate that. I simply say that acting upon that supposition I introduced my amendment of January 24. Had I not supposed that we had reached an agreement, I should not have introduced it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, after we came into the Senate the Senator from Vermont introduced the amendment, knowing that I did not agree to it. He continued to press it here, knowing that I did not agree to it. He accepted the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], knowing that I had not agreed to it. I stated on the floor, in reply to a question of the Senator from Iowa, that I could not agree to it. I finally went a great deal further in agreeing to it in my votes to-day than I thought I could at the time it was introduced.

I have been trying to help to-day to get the measure into such a shape that we could pass something. If the Senator persists, I think perhaps the whole thing had better go over for the session, and let us start over again at the next session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am afraid there is a good deal of amour propre on both sides of this matter. I take it that what the Senate is seeking is results, and not names, and yet now and then names have a great deal to do with things.

I know something about the procedure at the other end of the Capitol. The two Houses will be further apart, actually as well as nominally, if it is announced to the 400 Members of the House of Representatives—a body so numerous that they

have not time to study all questions in detail—that the Senate has rejected the House bill, and has substituted for it the Senate bill. Immediately they will say to one another: "What do you know about the Page bill?" "Not much; virtually nothing." "Our bill was considered in committee. What course shall we take?" Immediately it will be concluded that the best course will be to send the bill to the Committee on Agriculture of the House, in order that that committee may study the bill and report it back to the House with some enlightening information as to the differences between the two bills.

This is a very small body, composed of ninety-odd Members. Yet, to-day, we have seen the best-informed Senators on the floor rise and ask for information as to the difference between two bills which have been pending here for—I will not undertake to say how long. There is the real danger in this situation.

Of course, I understand, and everybody understands, how two very honorable men may meet and discuss matters, and one may say: "I am of the opinion that this ought to be done." The other one says: "I do not know but that I could agree with you about that." The first one says: "I think this ought to be done." Then the other, having heard what the first is willing to concede, will say: "I will agree to that." When you get through you have a mutual misunderstanding; and yet both part with no agreement on the part of either to do precisely what the other desires. In fact, I think it is well, when men meet together and begin to talk about a difference, to remember always that the conversation, as a rule, is tentative.

I ask the attention of the Senator from Vermont. I am not asking him a question, but I am afraid if you go to the House of Representatives, as numerous a body as it is, as crowded with all sorts of business as it is, four times as much crowded as we are in every way, and say to them that you have substituted for a House bill a Senate bill, unless you are able to say to them that the Senate bill is identical with the House bill or identical except for immaterial variations, the course taken by the House would be to send the bill to the committee instead of sending it at once to conference. We are within 30 or 35 days of adjournment, and I do not believe I would take that chance. The point I want to make is that the two Houses will be further apart actually, because they are nominally further apart, if you take that course.

I confess with some degree of shame that I have had my mind lately dwelling more upon some other matters than upon this measure, and I really do not know just how far the Committee of the Whole adopted the provisions of the Lever bill and the provisions of the Page bill, but if they have substantially included the essential parts of both bills in one bill, then I have no doubt about the fact that the prospect of securing actual legislation would be much better if the matter were sent to the House in that way.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was out of the Senate when the motion was made. Is this a motion to substitute, striking out all after the enacting clause?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the method of doing business in the Senate he understands better than I. We have nothing before us immediately, but the Senator from Vermont gave notice, I understand, that when the bill got into the Senate—

Mr. LODGE. We are in the Senate now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He would substitute the Page bill for the Lever bill.

Mr. LODGE. We are in the Senate now, but what I wanted information about, because I was out of the Chamber, was the question whether the motion is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Page bill.

Mr. LODGE. If that is the motion, of course that takes both bills into conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course it does.

Mr. LODGE. It retains the House number.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon; it takes both bills into conference under the House rules unless a motion is made and carried to send it to the Committee on Agriculture. If you take 400 men and they do not know what the Senate bill is, they are not going to rush it into conference. A conference in the Senate is bad enough, but a conference at the other end is worse, because there are 400 Members; things have to be understood, have to be explained to them, and men are not willing to take up an entirely new bill and have it voted upon under a proposition that on amendment numbered 5 of the Senate the House conferees disagreed, and on amendment numbered 3 the House conferees agree, and so on. The House insists upon keeping its business in its own hands upon a few occasions when it can, and when a matter goes to conference it really can not do so.

Mr. LODGE. I thought from what the Senator said the motion was to substitute the Senate bill. If it were substituting the Senate bill for the House bill, it would go back as a Senate bill with the Senate number, and of course it would go to the committee and would not go into conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is a distinction, but it is not a difference, and it is the difference to which the House will, in my opinion, pay attention, not the mere distinction.

Mr. LODGE. But I mean if it was a substitution, then it would go back, of course, as a Senate bill, and would go to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. By striking out all after the enacting clause it would be a Senate bill with a House number.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So, when it goes back to the House from the Senate and the Senate has stricken out all of the House bill except the enacting clause and substituted for it a Senate bill, unless you can assure the parties in charge of the bill, and not only can but are willing to assure the House, that the two bills are either identical or there are immaterial differences, the Members of the House will want to have it examined by a House committee. They are not willing to act merely upon the deliberations of the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Mississippi if the 400 Members of the House will feel that they know anything more about the Page amendment when it is put in divers amendments, as it has been in Committee of the Whole already, than when put in a single amendment in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Absolutely they will, because, in the first place, they have been discussing one bill, and whether they will know or not, they will think they know. This is a psychological problem, and they will think they know, and thinking that the House bill has come back passed by the Senate with certain amendments, they will be willing to let the House bill go to the conferees in order that the differences between the two Houses concerning the amendments may be settled. In other words, the essential thing in their minds is, if the House bill is passed, then there will be no trouble about sending it to conference at once.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert a substitute.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I then vote against the proposition now before the Senate made by the Senator from Vermont, and I desire to state very briefly why I will do it.

I have been for the Senate bill, prepared in a large measure by the Senator from Vermont, and for which he is entitled to the greatest possible credit from the beginning until he entered upon this discussion. I think it was I who first suggested to the Senator from Vermont that in order to make certain of some legislation upon the subject he offer Senate bill No. 3 as a substitute when the House bill came before the Senate.

I know nothing about the conference between the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Georgia, and I do not care to inquire into it. I only know that at one time the Senator from Vermont stated that he understood they had reached an agreement, and that the Senator from Georgia rejected that construction of their conference. My interest in this special matter was after that time, after the Senator from Georgia had indicated that he had entered into no agreement with the Senator from Vermont, after we all understood that the Senator from Vermont offered the substitute which bears the date of January 24, 1913. That substitute is a reproduction in its first nine sections of the House bill. There is no change whatsoever. The remaining sections are a reproduction of Senate bill No. 3, with the changes that had been made by the Senator from Vermont at the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia. He so declared.

I was intensely anxious that nothing should happen that would impair the chance for successful legislation, and therefore when the Senator from Georgia arose and said to the Senator from Vermont that he hoped he would offer that part of his substitute beginning with section No. 10 as an addition to the House bill, the House bill having been reproduced in terms in the first nine sections of the substitute in the hands of the Senator from Vermont, it seemed to me that we would be surer of that legislation if the suggestions of the Senator from Georgia were accepted, and I arose, caring not a whit whether the legislation came from the House or whether it came from the Senate. It makes no difference to me where it originates or who originates it. I simply desire the legislation itself. It seemed to me that the easiest and the surest way of reaching our end was to attach what might be called the Page part of this legislation to the Lever part of the legislation, if I may so designate a House bill and a Senate bill. I so declared, and

expressed the hope that the Senator from Vermont would adopt that course.

The Senator from Vermont did adopt that course, and so declared from his seat. He not only so declared, but he did offer these parts of his bill from section 10 through to the end as an amendment to the House bill. I know that he did that in perfect good faith. I know that he has but one desire, and that is to secure wise legislation upon this subject. But having embarked upon this course at my suggestion, he may feel himself at liberty to depart from that course, but I do not. I think we ought to adhere to the plan which resulted in the offer of the sections after No. 10 of the Senate bill. I believe so because there is a certain good faith which requires us to adhere to that course, and, second, because I believe it will tend to allay the irritation which little by little is creeping into the Senate upon the whole matter.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Vermont will not persist in offering the original bill as a substitute, if you please, for the House bill, but will be content to pursue the course which was adopted day before yesterday and which has already had results so gratifying to every friend of both agricultural and vocational education.

I must not be understood by this as meaning to say that there are not certain parts of the Lever bill, so called, rather objectionable to me. I think there ought to be some amendments, and we ought to make them now. I happened to be out of the Senate for a moment, and I did not dream that the amendment would be adopted so quickly and that the bill would pass from the Committee of the Whole into the Senate, or I would have suggested certain amendments. I do not believe at all in the extension of the franking privilege. That is a matter which is very easily corrected by a simple amendment. Striking out half a dozen lines in the House bill will correct that error, if it be an error, as I think it is.

Again, I agree with the Senator from Vermont that each State ought to duplicate the contribution of \$10,000 per year, as well as the additional sums that come in year after year. I think it would deepen their sense of responsibility, and it would be more in harmony with the entire structure of the House bill. But those are mere matters of detail that can be very easily corrected.

Again, there will have to be certain amendments made in the bill as it is now in the Senate. Day before yesterday section No. 10, as it appeared in the original bill offered, was stricken out upon my motion, and the language found in section 3 of the Senate bill was inserted in its stead. That makes a difference in certain phraseology throughout the whole bill, as the Senator from Vermont will assure the Senate. I think in half a dozen sections of the bill there recurs the words "rural-school fund," and after the adoption of my amendment there will be no rural-school fund. Wherever those words occur they must be stricken out and the words "secondary-school fund" must be substituted.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me, the original Senate bill No. 3 is as the Senator from Iowa desires it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely.

Mr. PAGE. It says "secondary schools, or schools of secondary grade, or high schools" shall mean schools offering courses in advance of the elementary schools, and so forth.

Mr. CUMMINS. But nowhere is it called a rural school.

Mr. PAGE. Not in the original Senate bill No. 3.

Mr. CUMMINS. Inasmuch as the original section has been now restored, the original phraseology describing it must be also restored.

I rather think that the Senator from Vermont did not benefit what might be called his part of the bill by trying to weave into it the suggestions of the Senator from Georgia. They do not fit very well, in my opinion, and I would be very glad if he could take the old Senate bill, with the exception of section 7, and offer it. I have no objection to that, but I do object, in view of everything that has occurred, to changing the whole course of procedure and now attempting to eliminate the House bill by substituting for it another measure. I would have been perfectly willing to have pursued that course had not the incident occurred which did occur here day before yesterday. I shall therefore vote against the proposed substitution by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE and Mr. BRISTOW addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. PAGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand that the bill as it is now before the Senate can be amended or perfected before the substitute amendment is voted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unquestionably.

Mr. BRISTOW. I therefore move to strike out section 3 of the bill as it is now before the Senate. It is the section that relates to the franking privilege, beginning on line 23, page 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out from the House bill section 3, which reads as follows:

That all correspondence for the furtherance of the purposes of this act issued from the agricultural colleges to their agents, or by the agents of the said extension departments thereof receiving the benefits of this act, shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge for postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster General from time to time may prescribe.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas moves to strike out the section just read. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think that section ought to be stricken from the bill. It is perfectly easy to make an allowance in their accounts to the agents in the field or to the colleges to be paid from the fund. The amount will not be large. But if you open this service to the franking privilege, you open a door to a great deal of misuse of the mails. It is almost impossible to keep the franking privilege within the proper limitations. I certainly think that a general provision like this for the franking privilege is a very mistaken one, and I hope it will be stricken from the bill before we vote upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW. I offer further to amend, on page 4, by striking out in line 7 after "part" the words "its allotment" and insert "any"; and also by striking out the word "additional" in line 8, so that it will read:

That no State shall be entitled to any part of any of these sums unless its legislature has heretofore provided, etc.

That makes the State appropriate an equal amount with the Federal Government of all the sums.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will not resist that motion, but I will state to the Senate the reason why this fixed sum was given. It was thought that some of the States, the smaller States, ought to have a fixed sum, and that is the theory upon which it was put in. So far as my own State is concerned and those I am especially interested in, they are perfectly ready to meet any sum the Government gives. I have no authority to consent to it, but I shall not oppose that amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. The reason why I proposed the amendment was that this is, of course, an aid to the States, and the aid is offered for two reasons. As I understand it, first it appropriates money from the General Treasury for that purpose, and that appropriation is used to encourage the States to appropriate their own money to carry on the work; so we not only appropriate the money that they will get the direct benefit from, but we induce the States to engage with the Government in this worthy cause by meeting the appropriation. I think it is nothing but just.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Senator takes his seat, do I understand that this is to strike out the provision which gives \$10,000 to each State unless the State duplicates the \$10,000?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; it requires the States to duplicate the \$10,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This bill, I understand, was drawn up upon a principle somewhat like the compromise giving each State two Senators and Representatives according to population. In other words, it was a compromise between territoriality and population and wealth. So it was concluded to give \$10,000 to each State to start with, regardless of wealth or poverty or the size of the State, and then for the balance of the appropriations, for the most part it was given in proportion to wealth; that is to say, it was given upon condition that the State should duplicate the amount which the Federal Government gave.

Whether there be a State in the Union which could not duplicate the \$10,000 or not I do not know. Nor does that interfere with the general principle at stake. If there be such a State, it ought not to be left out entirely. If there be not such a State, then all the States stand equally as regards the \$10,000. It does not seem to me that that provision ought to be stricken out. It might very well happen that a perfectly new State might be bound up with the expenses of its new birth and everything else and be embarrassed about money.

The Senator from Kansas has said that the object of this was to aid the States in doing certain work for the people. The primary object, I take it, is to aid the people, and to leave

the people without aid because the State could not help them does not seem to me to be right.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "of its allotment," and, in line 9, strike out the word "additional," so that if amended the proviso will read:

Provided further, That no State shall be entitled to any part of these sums unless its legislature has heretofore provided or until it shall provide, etc.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Kansas an additional reason that I recall now which was given for this appropriation to each State. It was that it guaranteed the immediate beginning of work everywhere without reference to appropriations, to give to each one of the States a demonstration of its value, and it would thereby lead the States to make the appropriations to call for the additional sums. I rather think that it is a desirable part of the bill.

Mr. BRISTOW. It seems to me that when the Federal Government proposes to aid the States in their educational development, this is going a good ways from our old idea. We are appropriating money for educational purposes to the various States, and it appears to me it is certainly good policy to require the various States to make an appropriation to meet that.

The objection has been made to meet that that this will fall more heavily upon the small States than the large States, a State of half a million of population as compared with a State of 5,000,000 population. But \$10,000 for the educational benefit of a half million people is a great deal larger proportionate contribution to the educational facilities of that State than if the State had 5,000,000 people.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will permit me an interruption, I think he is in error there. Territoriality has something to do with it. You may give a State, if it is a large State, with a sparse population, a certain sum of money to be expended for a certain purpose and it will not benefit it near so much as it would benefit a State of the same population with one-tenth of that area.

That reminds me of another defect in this bill. It says, for example, that there shall not be above one agricultural high school for five counties. Of course that is easy in the thickly settled Northeast, but without going down to Texas or Arizona, stopping at Mississippi on the way, five counties in my State, of which my own county would be a center, and Washington and Holmes and Hinds and Warren, the surrounding counties, would about duplicate the area of the State of Connecticut. So you have a high school there, with the people to attend it about five times as far, do you not understand? So they must go and board in order to get the same benefit that would be gotten in Rhode Island from taking the family buggy and driving in every day.

I am merely using that as an illustration just at present; but the assumption that just because a thing is a territorial area and called a State, it could get the same benefit from \$10,000 which a smaller and more compact area could get with many more children enjoying the privilege, is a mistake.

Mr. BRISTOW. It seems to me that, if the Federal Government is going to appropriate money for the educational facilities of the State, it is nothing but fair that the State should be required to meet that appropriation by an equal amount of its own funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me ask the Senator one more question, and then I shall not disturb him further: Is the purpose of the bill to help the States or to help the people?

Mr. BRISTOW. It is to help both—to help the people and to help the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I take it that the object and the purpose of the bill is not to help the political entity that we call a State, but that it is to help the citizens of the United States in acquiring a vocational and agricultural education.

Mr. BRISTOW. The educational system of the country has been in charge of the States. We have not launched out until this time upon any great national educational system. There are a great many people who question the wisdom of it. Now, certainly I question the wisdom of the Government making an appropriation direct to the States for educational purposes. I may consent to an appropriation, provided the State will provide an equal amount, the purpose being to encourage the establishment of proper educational facilities in all the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will permit me to break a promise so recently made, I will say that I agree with the Senator, of course, that the instrumentality, the trustee in a certain sense, is the State; but, after all, the beneficiaries are the children of the people in the States operating from the Federal Government through the States.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senate any further on this question. I wish the Senate, if they are so inclined, to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute Senate bill No. 3—

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

Mr. PAGE. I beg pardon; I thought the Senator from Kansas had yielded the floor.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I ask that the question be put on my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let us have the yeas and nays on that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WETMORE (when Mr. LIPPITT's name was called). My colleague [Mr. LIPPITT] has a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

Mr. RICHARDSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I wish to transfer the general pair which I have with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OLIVER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I wish to transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] to my colleague [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (after having voted in the affirmative). The occupant of the chair is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. As that Senator has not voted, the vote is withdrawn.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] did not vote. I have a pair with that Senator, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Bourne	Cummins	Kern	Perkins
Bradley	Dillingham	La Follette	Pointexter
Brandegge	Dixon	Lodge	Pomerene
Bristow	Gamble	McCumber	Root
Brown	Gronna	McLean	Sanders
Burnham	Guggenheim	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Catron	Hitchcock	Myers	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Nelson	Townsend
Crawford	Jones	Page	Wetmore
Cullom	Kanyon	Percy	Works

NAYS—18.

Bankhead	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	Swanson
Bryan	Johnston, Tex.	Perky	Thornton
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	
Heiskell	Owen	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—37.

Ashurst	Curtis	Massey	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	du Pont	Newlands	Stephenson
Borah	Fall	O'Gorman	Stene
Briggs	Foster	Oliver	Sutherland
Burton	Gallinger	Penrose	Tillman
Chamberlain	Gardner	Reed	Warren
Clapp	Gore	Richardson	Watson
Clarke, Ark.	Jackson	Shively	
Crane	Lea	Smith, Md.	
Culberson	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. BRISTOW's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. I offer a series of amendments which are purely formal. The Senate has adopted section 3 of the Senate

bill as now section 10 of the bill before the Senate. In that section the words used are "secondary schools" and not "rural schools." I therefore move to strike out the words "rural schools," where they are found; and I ask unanimous consent that it may be done without pointing out the line of each amendment where those words occur in sections 15, 16, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, and 33, and to substitute in each instance the words "secondary schools."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Wherever the words "rural schools" appear in sections 15, 16, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, and 33, they shall be stricken out and the words "secondary schools" substituted therefor.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I rather hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa may be adopted, although I want to state here and now that there have been, I will not say a multitude of amendments, but a great many amendments made to this bill, so that the bill is almost ridiculous in its make-up, if we take it in its present form. For instance, we have changed it, I think, by adding after the word "States" the words "and Territories." The bill from first to last has been drawn with particular reference to States, and I do not believe it will articulate with the Territorial laws. It is true that you have amended the Lever bill, so called, in two very important particulars to-day; you have, by a very decided vote, stricken out that feature which gave the States \$10,000 each without the States paying another \$10,000, and you have stricken out the feature giving them the franking privilege.

Now, I want to terminate this debate, so far as I am concerned, by saying that it is not exceedingly material whether you do or do not adopt the amendment which I am about to offer. I am simply going to add that I believe that if we take the Page bill in its entirety, we shall have a perfected bill, while, if we take the bill which we have amended so hastily, we shall get a bill that is full of incongruities.

In closing let me simply add that I hope the friends of Senate bill 3 will feel that, all things considered, it is wise to adopt the amendment which I have suggested, but there will be no broken hearts if this is not done. I believe it should be done, because I think Senate bill 3 is the better bill, but whatever the vote of the Senate may be I shall be satisfied.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to say that at the last session the Page bill was presented to me. I examined it quite thoroughly, and was convinced of the wisdom and the propriety of the measure. After that I received very many letters—nearly 200, as I recall—from a great many educational institutions in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania urging its passage. I pledged myself to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] that I would stand by him. I voted for the proposition that was suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]; but since it has been deemed best and wisest upon the part of the Senator from Vermont to urge the passage of his bill, in this controversy I will square myself with my agreement though the heavens fall. I am going to stand by the bill of the Senator from Vermont.

I want to vote for some measure that will tend to dignify labor. The whole trend of the times has been in contradiction to the man or the woman who works with his or her hands. Every effort has been made to hold up to the average young man the idea of being a lawyer, a doctor, or a theologian; the idea has been instilled into him that a profession should be his chief ambition in life. I want to do what little I can to dignify labor and induce men to labor. It is all very well in the clamor of the day to urge the youth of the land to stay on the farm; but the disposition of the country has been to ignore the farm boy, to frown on him with sneers and sundry little innuendoes aggravating to the sensitive mind. This has driven myriads of boys from the farm. I shall vote with the greatest pleasure and the greatest relish for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have listened to this discussion and have been considering at different times the bill in charge of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] for a great many months, and I think I am somewhat familiar with it. As I understand, the only objection to passing the substitute is the parliamentary situation, and possibly some agreement which seems to have been rather unilateral, the minds of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] never having met in a common understanding

in regard to it. Aside from that, no one questions that the so-called Page bill contains all the features of the Lever bill. I have heard nobody dispute that proposition.

Senators say that possibly the measure will have a different standing before the other House if we pass the House bill as it has been amended instead of the Page bill. I am somewhat familiar with the procedure in the House, and I can not understand that there are any more difficulties attaching to the proposed substitute than will attend the bill as we have already amended it. It has been amended and will go to conference or to a committee of the other House. It will have to go to a committee according to the argument of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], because it materially changes the House bill. This does not necessarily follow and probably it will not.

So far as I am concerned, if I were to consider the parliamentary situation and were to be governed entirely by the effect either upon the other House or upon this, the question would be decided in my mind by the fact that the Senator from Vermont has had charge of this bill and has pressed it in season and out for many months, yielding too frequently, as it seems to me, to the requests of Senators, in order that they might place something in its stead. Further, if I understand aright, up until the day before yesterday this bill has been as much discussed as has the Lever bill and is better understood in the Senate. So it occurs to me that we can accomplish all that all Senators want, so far as legislation is concerned, if the House bill be amended by substituting after the enacting clause the Page bill, which, I repeat, contains everything that is in the Lever bill and is drawn with greater care. Its author has deliberated upon it for months; it has profited by the work of experts and is clear and harmonious in its terms. On the other hand, I venture to state that few Senators understand just what has been done by the Senate to the House bill. We know it has been changed day after day, here a little and there a little, but I feel sure that no one knows exactly what the bill is or whether it has been properly constructed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will permit me, why does he think so? It never was submitted to a committee; it has never been before the Agricultural Committee at all; and it has never been scrutinized line by line or section by section by the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Which bill has not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Page bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Page bill has been presented to the Senate from the Committee on Agriculture and was discussed by the Senator from Vermont for several days, as I remember. It has been generally understood and discussed throughout the country. I have known few bills that have seemed to excite more interest and more attention than has the Page bill. The people understand it; and I confess, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I understand it much better than I do the Lever bill as it has been amended up to this moment. I quite agree with the Senator from Vermont that if we pass the Lever bill to-day possibly we may pass something that we do not understand. Few Senators know just what we have done and the parts of the bill may be inharmonious. I desire to ask the Senator from Vermont a question which has been suggested to me by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. Was his bill before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate?

Mr. PAGE. Of course, we have discussed this matter a long time in the Senate, and I supposed that every feature had been before the committee. It may be, however, that there have been some amendments made in the Senate which were never considered by the committee; but the bill has been before the committee and has been considered in all its essential features.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand, then, that Senate bill No. 3 has been considered by the committee?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; and it has been reported.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not like to yield until I get an answer from the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. It has been reported.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then, it went to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, did it not?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And was reported by that committee?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the Senator allow me a word there?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I should like to have that question answered.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was a member of the subcommittee which considered the Page bill. We had hearings on the substance of this bill, not in the technical form in which it is here now, but the entire scope of this bill, the agricultural features

and the vocational educational features of it, were considered. Representatives from the leading colleges of the United States, both agricultural colleges and universities, came to Washington on two different occasions, and I remember that we had hearings which extended over several days and that a report was submitted by the Senator from Vermont to the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—a most exhaustive report upon the different features of this bill, the committee having given him authority to collect the information. This proposed legislation is the result of all that. I doubt if during the last two years there has come before the Senate a bill that was the subject of more extensive preliminary investigation and work and the subject of a larger correspondence with educational leaders of this country than the Page bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Now, let me ask the Senator from Vermont directly, Is it not true that Senate bill No. 3 was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and through the Senator from Vermont reported to the Senate?

Mr. PAGE. It was.

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PAGE. In just a moment.

Mr. BURNHAM. I merely want to corroborate the statement of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. That is all I care to say.

Mr. PAGE. The bill was reported to the Senate, but subsequently was redrafted in some minor particulars. I asked unanimous consent of the Senate that the redrafted bill might be substituted in place of the bill originally reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that unanimous consent was given.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I have both the bills here. The one which was passed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is 16 pages long, while the bill subsequently presented and now being considered is 28 pages long; so that the second bill can not be exactly the same measure.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I hold in my hand Senate bill No. 3, Calendar No. 348, upon which I find the following notation:

In the Senate of the United States.

April 6, 1911. Mr. PAGE introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. February 26, 1912. Reported by Mr. PAGE, with amendments.

June 14, 1912. By unanimous consent the text of original bill and reported amendments withdrawn, and substitute reported, placed on calendar, and printed in roman.

July 24, 1912. Ordered reprinted as agreed to in Committee of the Whole; all in roman.

That is the record of the bill as it appears here on the desks of Senators.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to propound an inquiry to the Senator from Georgia? I did not understand his reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. Do I understand, then, that the bill now offered as an amendment, consisting of 28 pages, has never been considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Unquestionably it has never been before the Agricultural Committee at all.

Mr. SWANSON. Not before a committee of the Senate for consideration at all?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The first Senate bill, No. 3, 16 pages long, was passed on and reported by the Agricultural Committee. After that was submitted to the Senate the Senator from Vermont redrafted his bill, and the bill now presented, 28 pages long, has never been before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is the Senator—

Mr. SWANSON. And my inquiry—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Just a moment. Is the Senator from Georgia on the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then I take it the Senator from Georgia gave his consent that the original bill and reported amendments should be withdrawn and the substitute, as presented by the Senator from Vermont, should stand in place of the bill as reported by him.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My statement was that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had not examined and passed upon that bill. My consent was no more than the consent of each other Senator. The Senator from Vermont had

charge of the matter. He referred to it as his bill, and it was his bill, and when he asked to present a substitute we all consented. The Senator from Michigan consented just as I did; but the bill did not go back to the Committee on Agriculture. It was the Committee of the Whole Senate that consented to the substitution.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not complaining about it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My only point was that the bill of 28 pages has never been considered in detail by the Senate and has never been considered in detail by the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Right there let me ask the Senator from Georgia a question, with the consent of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. My question is as to whether or not the extra pages are not made up of the Lever bill, which is now attached to the Page bill?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Not at all; no. The portion of the bill which is similar to the Lever bill is exactly the same in the first bill of 16 pages and in the second bill of 28 pages. There are a number of quite substantial changes in the two bills. The new bill, which was presented with the 28 pages in it, has quite a number of features different from the old bill of 16 pages which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry approved.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think two things are undisputed at the present time, namely, that the pending bill, the Lever bill as it has been amended, contains the provisions of the Lever bill and also practically all that was contained in the Page bill. On the other hand, the Page amendment contains practically everything that was in the Page bill, and also all of the principal provisions of the Lever bill. Whichever way we vote, we are practically passing the same bill, whether we adopt the Page amendment to the Lever bill, or amend the Lever bill by inserting the Page bill as a substitute.

My vote is going to be governed by this consideration: The Senator from Vermont has had this bill before the Senate for at least two years. He has devoted a great deal of study to it. Instead of having a proposition now which comes in the shape of divers amendments attached in different ways, he has the same proposition drawn up logically, properly, and in its order; and it is known as the Page bill. So that practically it is a question whether we will adopt the bill that has the name of a Member of the House attached to it, or the name of the Senator from Vermont. That is practically all there is to it now. Considering the length of time we have had the Page bill before us, I stand ready to give my colleague the compliment of voting that his bill shall be passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation as the Chair understands it.

Sundry amendments have been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole. The question is, the bill having been reported to the Senate, whether or not the Senate shall concur in those amendments. The Senator from Vermont proposes before that action is taken to strike out and insert. The Chair thinks that can not be done, but that the question should first be put upon concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, for the reason that any Senator can ask for a separate vote upon any amendment agreed to. So that, whether or not the amendments agreed to as in Committee of the Whole are concurred in in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont can then offer his substitute.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, can the Senator from Vermont offer a substitute after the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole have been concurred in in the Senate? I venture to suggest that the point at which he must offer his substitute is before we pass in the Senate on the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole. That is, he must offer it as a substitute for the original bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why can not the Senator from Vermont offer his substitute for the original bill after the original bill has been perfected by the amendments which the Senate has adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that that can be done.

Mr. LODGE. It can be done in that way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendments agreed to as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LODGE. It occurred to me that under our usual practice, after amendments made as in Committee of the Whole had been concurred in in the Senate, it would be impossible then for the Senate to vote out those amendments, because they would have been adopted both as in Committee of the Whole and in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks a motion to strike out the entire bill and insert would be in order.

The question now is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I now move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the amendment which was offered by me on the 17th of January, which is identical with Senate bill No. 3, reported to the Senate June 14, 1912. It is what is known as the Page bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment, and read to the end of section 5, on page 5.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if it is in order, I move to dispense with the further reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can ask unanimous consent that the further reading be dispensed with.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the question?

Mr. LODGE. The question is on substituting the Page bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. The vote is being taken on the question of substituting the Page bill?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GARDNER (when his name was called). Notwithstanding my pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE] on the pending measure, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and I withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I wish to transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted in the negative). I will ask if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that that Senator has not voted.

Mr. CULBERSON. I transfer my general pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and will allow my vote to stand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], and for that reason withholds his vote.

Mr. PERKINS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMOOT. I was requested to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER] is paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]; that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; and that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON] is paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bradley	Dillingham	Lodge	Poin Dexter
Brandegge	Gamble	McCumber	Sanders
Brown	Gardner	McLean	Smoot
Catron	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Stephenson
Chilton	Guggenheim	Nelson	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Wetmore
Crawford	Jones	Page	Works
Cullom	Kenyon	Perkins	

NAYS—30.

Ashurst	Cummins	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Fletcher	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bourne	Heiskell	Newlands	Swanson
Bristow	Hitchcock	Paynter	Thomas
Bryan	Johnston, Ala.	Percy	Thornton
Burnham	Johnston, Tex.	Perky	Williams
Burton	Kern	Pomerene	
Culberson	La Follette	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—34.

Bacon	du Pont	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Fall	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Briggs	Foster	Owen	Stone
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Sutherland
Clapp	Gore	Reed	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Jackson	Richardson	Warren
Crane	Lea	Root	Watson
Curtis	Lippitt	Shively	
Dixon	Massey	Smith, Md.	

So Mr. PAGE's amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 30, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 29, 1913.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our heavenly Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, we realize that we are involved in a moral order which Thou hast ordained; that we can do nothing without Thee; yet we may set ourselves against that order and bring harm to ourselves and others; hence we pray for wisdom to guide us, strength to sustain us in a willingness to work with Thee, that we may hasten the coming of Thy kingdom upon the earth. And Glory and honor and praise be Thine forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as this is Calendar Wednesday, I desire to ask unanimous consent that I may move to elect three or four gentlemen to fill vacancies on committees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to nominate certain gentlemen to fill vacancies on committees.

Mr. MANN. I assume that this will take no time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. None at all. There is no contest about it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the Committee on Ways and Means, I wish to make the following nominations to fill existing committee vacancies:

Hon. JOHN H. ROTHERMEL to the vacancy on the Appropriations Committee occasioned by the death of Hon. J. G. McHenry.

Hon. GEORGE WHITE to the vacancy on the Appropriations Committee occasioned by the resignation of Hon. James Cox.

Hon. SCOTT FERRIS to the chairmanship of the Public Lands Committee occasioned by the resignation of Hon. Joseph T. Robinson.

Hon. C. B. SMITH to the vacancy on the Foreign Affairs Committee occasioned by the resignation of Hon. William Sulzer.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, the question is on the election of those nominated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The question was taken, and the above-named Members were elected.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 28499) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second times, and with the accompanying report (No. 1413), ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.